

GSA Council Meeting AGENDA
Monday, December 10, 2012, 6 pm, **Telus 1-34**

A vegetarian dinner will be served at 5:15 pm

OPEN SESSION

1. Approval of the 10 December 2012 Agenda
2. Approval of the Minutes from the 19 November 2012 GSA Council meeting
Attachments:
Minutes from the 19 November 2012 GSA Council meeting
3. Changes in Council Membership
 - i. Introduction of new Councillors (*If you are new to Council, please let us know it is your first meeting*)
 - ii. Farewell to Departing Councillors (*If this is your last Council meeting, or if your last Council meeting is approaching, please let us know*)

**Attached
Numbered Pages**

2.0-2.21

Presentations and Councillor Announcements

4. University of Alberta International: Individual Award Funding for Education Abroad and Introduction to UGo.
President Ashlyn Bernier President will introduce the speakers and present the item.
Guests: Kate Jennings (Director, Education Abroad) and Dr. Zhi Jones (Associate Director, Education Abroad). Takeaway handouts will be provided at the meeting. Presentation will begin after roll call at 6:00pm.
5. PAW 101: Briefing and Update on Physical Activity and Wellness Centre (PAW).
Ashlyn Bernier (President) will introduce the speakers and present the item.
Guest: Ben Louie (University Architect), Doug Ramsey (External Architect with Group 2), and Kyle Braithwaite (Project Manager). Presentation will begin at approximately 6:30pm.
6. Councillor Announcements

Reports

7. President
 - i. President's Report (**attached**)
 - ii. GSA Board (**attached**)
 - iii. Budget and Finance Committee (**attached**)
 - iv. Governance Committee (**no meetings this reporting period**)

**7.0 - 7.1
7.2
7.3**

v.	Nominating Committee (attached)	7.4 - 7.5
8.	Vice-President Academic	
	i. Vice-President Academic's Report (attached)	8.0
9.	Vice-President Student Services	
	i. Vice-President Student Services' Report (attached)	9.0 - 9.1
	ii. Student Affairs Advisory Committee (joint chair: Vice-President Student Life) (no meetings this reporting period)	
10.	Vice-President Student Life	
	i. Vice-President Student Life's Report (attached)	10.0 - 10.1
	ii. Awards Selection Committee (see Item 18)	
11.	Vice-President Labour	11.0 - 11.2
	i. Vice-President Labour's Report (attached)	
	ii. Negotiating Committee (see Item 16)	
	iii. Labour Relations Committee (no meetings this reporting period)	
12.	Senator	
	i. Senator's Report (no report this period)	
13.	Speaker	
	i. Speaker's Report (no report this period)	
14.	Chief Returning Officer	
	i. Chief Returning Officer's Report (attached)	14.0
	ii. Elections and Referenda Committee (will be meeting soon to review policy)	
15.	GSA Management	
	i. Executive Director's Report (attached)	15.0 - 15.3

Action Items, Elections, Appointments, Special Business

16.	Update on Collective Agreement Negotiations (CLOSED SESSION) . VP Labour Brent Epperson will present the item (no attachments).	
17.	Proposed Revisions to AEGS Funding Programs VP Student Services Naseeb Adnan will present the item. <i>Attachments:</i>	
	• Outline of Issue	17.0
	• Proposed Revisions to AEGS Funding Programs	17.1 - 17.31

18. GSA Awards: Proposed Changes to the Graduate Student Teaching Award and to the Graduate Student Teaching Assistant Awards

VP Student Life Huimin Zhong will present the item.

Attachments:

- Outline of Issue
- Proposed Changes to the Graduate Student Teaching Award and to the Graduate Student Teaching Assistant Awards

18.0
18.1-18.2

19. CLE Subcommittee on Attributes and Competencies Report Draft. *Distributed for information only.*

VP Academic Nathan Andrews will present the item.

Attachments:

- CLE SAC Report Draft (Dated November 21, 2012)

19.0 - 19.6

20. Elections **(none at this time)**

21. Special Business **(none at this time)**

Question Period

22. Written Questions

23. Oral Questions

Adjournment

**Meeting Minutes
19 November 2012
GSA Council Meeting**

[Note: All materials referred to in these Minutes are stored in hard copy in the Official File, as well as electronically]

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 pm.

Approval of Agenda

1. Approval of the 19 November 2012 Agenda

Members had before them the 19 November 2012 Consolidated Agenda, which had been distributed on 08 November 2012.

The Agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

Approval of Minutes

2. Minutes

i. **Minutes from the 15 October 2012 GSA Council meeting**

Members had before them the 15 October 2012 GSA Council Minutes, which had been distributed on 08 November 2012.

The Minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

Changes in Council Membership

3. Changes in Council Membership

i. **Introduction of new Councillors**

This was the first meeting for a number of Councillors: Biological Sciences, Cell Biology, Electrical & Computer Engineering, Renewable Resources, Sociology, and Speech Pathology & Audiology.

ii. **Farewell to departing Councillors**

None.

iii. **Short Briefing on Council Proceedings**

Two documents, "Standing Orders of Council: Digest" and "Governance 102: Foundations of Parliamentary Practice for GSA Councillors" were distributed in advance. These will be part of the package distributed to all new Councillors. Councillors wishing to obtain a copy of these documents are to contact Speaker Fred Wu at gsa.speaker@ualberta.ca.

Prepared by K Biittner and C Thomas for GSA Council 10 Dec 2012

Presentations and Councillor Announcements

4. 2013-2014 Proposed Residence Rate Increases:

Vice-President Huimin Zhong introduced the guest (Doug Dawson, Executive Director, Ancillary Services) and presented the item. No material was distributed in advance. A list of questions prepared by Vice-President Huimin Zhong (presented at the 31 October 2012 and 14 November 2012 GSAB meetings) and a list of proposed residence rates were projected. Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services) briefly spoke to the proposed residence rate increases and answered the projected questions that had also been distributed to him in advance.

1. Question: Ancillary Services operates on the “break-even” principal rather than for profit. How do you define the “break-even” principal? Does the University have a clear definition of it? Given that, why is there a proposed 2.36% weighted average rent increase for 2013-2014, which is higher than the 2.15% CPI projection?

Response: Ancillary Services received no centralized or provincial funding; we must generate our own operating costs. The University is clear that a “break-even” principal includes covering all fixed and variable expenses and creating reserves to provide for future costs such as differed maintenance and residence expansion. The CPI is an indicator, but I feel it is not the correct one for this province in talking about the rents we hope to approve for 2013, as there are specific issues relating to construction, repair, and maintenance costs in this province versus other parts of Canada and in the US (a volatile market).

2. Question: Why is there such a high differential of rent increase between 4-month and 8-month leases in Campus Saint-Jean, I House, and Lister, with one being 2.15% (8 month lease) and the other 5% (4 month lease) respectively?

Response: The difference is we are trying to manage risk in 4 and 8 month term residences. They are typically at 100% occupancy in September but we do have students who leave in December. This means we wind up with large liabilities in the second term so we need to ensure there is an incentive for students to stay for the whole eight months.

3. Question: Why are there higher increases for Bachelor and 1 Bedroom units in Newton Place, 2.5% and 3.5% respectively, and 3.5% for Studio Suites in Graduate Student Residence? And how did you arrive at these numbers?

Response: I would first like to point out that your student representatives did a good job on behalf of students. They were able to negotiate a base increase of 10% over two years instead of the proposed 15%. Simply, particular apartment styles represent a greater value for students, so there is additional incentive for those styles.

4. Question: Do you have the statistics of rents for on-campus residences from other Canadian universities? How do the U of A figures compare?

Response: We do track rents at Albertan universities. We feel that comparing to universities in Quebec or Southern Ontario does not give us good data. We will shortly have data from Mount Royal, the University of Lethbridge, the University of Calgary, and MacEwan. Our rents do appear low versus those for the rest of the province.

5. Question: Do you expect the same level of increases for certain residences in the following years or is this a one-time increase?

Response: It is too early to tell what the baseline increase will be. We have been successful in holding the line on expenses; our expenses have been dropping relative to our revenue, and we have been going into reserves and so preventing emergency rent increases to catch up with serious maintenance).

Follow up questions:

1. Question: If Ancillary Services is operating on the “break-even” principle, the rent increase proposed should be based on cost rather than anything else. Then why is it necessary for the rent of certain residences, such as Newton Place, to line up with the similar off-campus residences?

Response: We need to cover costs. We do look at similar products around campus and beyond. We look at amenities provided (power, gas, furnished, etc.) and try to adjust for that as they serve as internal indicators for where students are choosing to live. 87% of students will choose to live on campus if it is an equal offering to something off campus. The U of A has wide variety of offerings with long waiting lists.

2. Question: What caused the deficit in Ancillary Services? Do you think increasing rents is the most effective and right way to address these deficits?

Response: We need to combine modest increases in rents with increases in efficiency (where savings can be found). This is the first time in many years we have presented a budget with residences in the black. This was done through a combination of cost controls and rent increases, we need both to effectively manage costs. We prefer to have modest rent changes versus what we saw in the early parts of the decade with high increases. Part of the current deficit situation was created because they did not take this approach years ago. This was also in addition to the rent freeze in the early 90s, which lead to deferred maintenance issues. Modest yearly increases are a way to spread out the liability.

3. Question: You mentioned that the higher rent increase, such as in Newton Place and the Graduate Student Residence, is because you want to line up with the market. But do on-campus residences offer the same level of facilities and are they valued to the same degree as the off-campus residences by students? Do you have a formal survey of students or reports to illustrate this?

Response: In our experience we find that most students see living on campus as worth a great deal of value in terms of proximity to labs, libraries, like minded individuals, etc. It is an important factor in the reason we have between 11,000 – 15,000 students waiting to get into residences. This is part of why we are building more.

During and following the presentation, a number of questions were asked:

Tessa Hawkins (Art and Design) asked: do you think the facilities are worth the cost asked, even considering convenience?

Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services) responded: I do think so. They represent value for students. If the waiting lists are an indicator, there are many students wanting to take advantage of our products. But we do have location, which represents a lot of value.

Tessa Hawkins (Art and Design) Supplementary: Do you find you get a lot of turnover? How would you retain people?

Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services): Rents do have something to do with construction costs. Many of our builds are debt builds. We have little flexibility in the terms we offer. In our data, we are seeing a lot of re-ups, and vacancy rates are low.

Tess Hawkins (Art and Design) Supplementary: You do not offer a 4 or 8 month term in grad residences. Why?

Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services) responded: We do work with graduate students who come and go at particular times but our revenue stream does require 12 month leases. Few construction costs can sustain 4 and 8 month term leases.

Ravi Singh (Business MBA) asked: You are proposing an increase across different residences, so are these proposed increases to strictly cover utility increases?

Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services): The office of resource planning provides us with projections of utility costs. These are factored into the price increases along with other indicators like tuition increases. There is a great deal of analysis.

Ravi Singh (Business MBA) Supplementary: In situations where there are roommates sharing a residence, is there a regulatory rule that leads to things like multiple mailings?

Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services) responded: We are having conversations about moving to digital notification systems such as making entries on electronic accounts rather than sending out paper notices.

Qiang Li (CAL) asked: To overcome the deficit are you just increasing the rent or have you considered internal cuts?

Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services) responded: Internal costs, such as costs of services, fuel, and maintenance, do increase but we also see salary increases. We try to manage those through finding technology efficiencies, partnering with the private sector to keep rent increases to a minimum, etc. The rent increase is below what CMA is projecting. But it allows us to build up our reserves so we can repair things like elevators or deal with a really cold winter with high utility costs without going back to students with large supplemental increases. Yes, students will continue to find less expensive accommodation off campus but this is the way a free market works.

Zhen Li (CAL) asked: With these rent increases are we going to have enough reserve funds to guarantee there will be no more supplementary rent increases?

Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services) responded: I hope so. I don't know why reserves weren't built in the 80s and 90s. The Board realized that this was an issue so we began to build. There are dedicated capital reserves now created at the time of construction. There are three reserves: utilities (\$1M), operating (\$1M - representing our worst case scenario if we lost something like Michener Park), and capital (available for emergency breakdown and maintenance, which is really growing, allowing us to make major upgrades).

Zhen Li (CAL) supplementary: Can you explain why expansions count as a reserve fund?

Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services): In our environment we need to provide the necessary equity. The University cannot always provide the large amount of money required. This reserve fund allows us to generate the money requires versus building on the traditional debt financing.

Susan Cake (Sociology) asked: Can you elaborate on why you compare with only universities in Alberta?

Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services) responded: This is primarily because all Alberta universities have the same key drivers (i.e., utility and construction costs). Other markets have union settlements etc. that are quite different, as well as, different interpretations of self-sufficiency.

There were no further questions.

5. FGSR Reorganization

President Ashlyn Bernier introduced the guests, Dr. Martin Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost and Vice-President Academic) and Dr. Mazi Shirvani (Dean of FGSR) and presented the item, noting that this issue was discussed in closed session during the last meeting of Council. This issue was also discussed at length at President Indira Samarasekera's townhall meeting (16 November 2012). The President described the consultation process involving elected officials and graduate student focused groups. She also welcomed guests from Department of English Graduate Students Collective.

No material was distributed in advance. During the presentation, Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost and Vice-President Academic) provided a quick synopsis of the issue and progress to date, stating:

- In general we would like to see if there are ways we can improve the overall graduate student experience at the U of A; many universities across Canada are asking this question; there are a number of things driving this question; we want to construct an environment that attracts the best graduate students, and want to ensure that programs provide a valuable experience regardless of what you want to do when you graduate (note that a relatively small proportion of graduates stay in academia, about 30% in the US and Canada); seeking ways to broaden experience beyond preparation for academic career;
- This desire for improvement initiated a consultation process overseen by Dr. Catherine Swindlehurst; looking at conducting 60 focus group sessions trying to get perspectives from students, professors, and administrators; questioning how we can have FGSR best serve the community including administrative purposes and central offerings that could produce opportunities for students in addition to those provided within faculties (assistance with scholarship application preparation, career advice, presentation advice, professional development opportunities, best practices in mentorship for faculty, etc.);

Prepared by K Biittner and C Thomas for GSA Council 10 Dec 2012

- Also interested in how we can measure the quality of graduate programs; anticipate that going forward we might be able to steer resources where we see quality; see where we can make recruitment processes more effective; how we can better represent our programs to attract the very best students to the U of A; would see resources following quality (results based budgeting);
- Also want to know where the gaps in quality are.

Floor then turned over to Dr. Mazi Shirvani (Dean of FGSR) who added:

- We are also looking at the institution of quality measures; this has been undertaken by FGSR Council;
- FGSR Council has been tasked to set up a reasonably representative working group to see what major universities and disciplines use as quality measures; compile a list (not going to limit to it to just performance measures, but with real quality measures); will report to FGSR Council and are willing to report to GSA Council too; the idea is to try to bring some formal quality assurance into graduate education at the U of A, which now is essentially unregulated and is behind other universities;
- Nothing will come to FGSR Council without the GSA and FGSR having seen the drafts. Everything will make more sense once we start to get work done but I am happy to come report back to Council to walk everyone through the progress;
- This is not so much about reorganizing FGSR but about reorganizing graduate education at the U of A; the FGSR is just one piece;
- Regarding quality of graduate students, we want to maintain the quality of recruits; this is not to say that current students are not of quality.

The floor was then opened to questions.

Ravi Singh (Business) asked: Understanding that only 20% of PhDs are moving into academic positions, does this mean that only 20% of our students have the quality to move into academia?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: I do not think this represents an oversupply. In Canada, the number of PhD students per 100,000 people is significantly lower than in other developed countries. What we are doing is underutilizing our graduate school graduates in society. It is a difficult period in the academic market place. We are seeing a lot of downsizing that is creating a supply of experienced professors who have an advantage over an untried, newly completed postdoc. What we

need to be doing, what we are hearing, is that opportunities for graduate students to make leadership contributions to society exist in many other areas. We need to ensure our graduate students are adequately equipped to meet that need. We need to make sure students are trained to respond to forces like Tri-Council scholarships; but we also need to provide other skills (enterprise, fine arts), which could be applied to other areas of life. If we are not equipping people for other opportunities then we are essentially sending our graduate student out under-skilled. We want to give our people a broader skill set so they are more marketable, and have more potential. I don't believe we have too many students but we should be recruiting and inspiring the very best undergraduate students to pursue graduate studies.

Ravi Singh (Business MBA) supplementary: I understand focus has been on funding, are we considering using industry connections/partnerships?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: Absolutely. Industry is keen to do this. This requires us to look at the FGSR differently; maybe look at it more like a school of graduate studies which would be in a position to partner with industry. These partnerships would be coordinated centrally by the school but students would be given opportunities to build networks and relationships that could ultimately result in a job.

Zhen Li (CAL) asked: I am concerned about the penalty system. As a university we want to see the success of all faculties. What is the rationalization in penalizing those that are failing? Is that system finalized?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: No penalty system is proposed but rather funding would be directed towards quality. It depends on the time frame. If we have good quality measures we can then identify what needs to be fixed. If there is a weakness then we can direct money to fix it. But we do not want to support mediocrity. By knowing how programs are performing we can use our resources better. It is more of a carrot and stick process.

Dr. Mazi Shirvani (Dean of FGSR) responded: If I could add one thing, there are unused resources even now (depending on how programs are set up and being run). For example, if a department has funding they never use, is reducing that funding a penalty? So to some extent, it is a question of redirecting financing. If we can get departments to use all of the resources they have today in the context of a plan to improve quality, it may be very helpful for those programs.

Zhen Li (CAL) supplementary: To clarify on your previous description, we are not looking at shifting resources to faculties performing well but are shifting resources to those who are not?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: We want to use our resources to produce the best programs we can. We need to define what we mean as best. Once we've identified programs that are performing not as well as we would like we have a choice: it may be a different way of configuring that program or the program may need investment to do better. Once we have flexibility in our program then we will have the opportunity to build upon strength or to build up strength.

Roy Coultard (Senator) asked: In my experience, the culture of the institution on the ground level is very unfriendly to graduate students. How can we move forward to improve graduate studies when what people see at the ground level is not welcoming, does not make graduate students feel like valued members of the community, and is generally negative?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: One of the things we will do with this process is heightening awareness in our faculties of graduate programs as being a part of the quality measure through which resources flow. On the whole what we've done with resources for graduate students has been essentially "ditto" – we provide the same money to each place with small increments. The amount of resources provided has not been related to performance or to the relative value faculties gives to graduate students. It was just a process. This initiative will start to change that process. It is a complex thing to change. As we start to think about reallocating resources, we need to recognize the sensitivity that exists within faculties for those resources. We want those faculties that do accept graduate students as important to be rewarded with resources. This is a shift in distribution of resources towards quality. Is service one of those quality measures? No reason it shouldn't be. I believe faculties will respond because a measure will be in place and that measure will be associated with a measure. We need students to advocate for things like service as being a metric.

Dr. Shirvani (Dean of FGSR) responded: In terms of this planning, we know there are individuals who are in misery across the board; those people need to be dealt with differently but a lot of people are simply too overworked, too harassed by the demands of their job to have patience for students, and this has to become part of larger rethink of graduate education. Let us do an exercise: how many hours a month do you think you should get from your department in terms of administrative services? Let us say just an hour a month. At the rate of one hour a month, you will need one grad coordinator per

100 students. You would then need for 7,500 graduate students at least 75 support staff to provide just basic services. But many of these staff deal with other things as part of their job. If we just think of the workload, to provide a reasonable level of service immense levels of HR resources are required. In the past this has not been part of the planning but it will be part of it moving forward. It is required that this become part of the experience. It will be part of our bigger thinking.

Brianna Wells (Guest, English and Film Studies) asked: Regarding the timeline for the review process, I understand there has been a couple of weeks for consultation and that there will be a couple of weeks still to come. I also understand there will be a report. What are the dates associated with the follow up? Do you think this amount of consultation is acceptable for the scope of the changes required?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: We should have a report around the 20th of December from Dr. Swindlehurst's focus groups. We have a number of things running in parallel. We will have the quality measures group report in February 2013. We will pull it all together in April 2013. We have a good idea of what it is we want to start to change, what it is we want to do. Is it adequate? We are measuring this based on a number of interactions versus how long it takes. We can drag out the consultation process but then we may not have the same number of interactions we are having in this intense period. But we do need information/feedback about the process.

Brianna Wells (Guest, English and Film Studies) supplementary: To comment, the condensed timeframe is difficult for graduate students as there are many conflicts with our schedules. What kind of consultation will be available after these reports are produced?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: What we are anticipating is that when we pull it all together we'll be in a position to have a town hall meeting. We'll bring together the findings of the consultation, and host a town hall meeting of graduate students. Any advice on how to run the town hall is appreciated. We certainly want to ensure that when we pull together our findings that people have an opportunity to address the results.

Billal Sultani (Laboratory Medicine and Pathology) asked: When students are invited to join the U of A, there is a process in which FGSR is involved and then another one for faculties. There seems to be a disconnect between the two. I am wondering if during the reorganization if FGSR may have a more active role in how faculties communicate with students? It can be confusing

because offers vary greatly. There are also issues with promises from professors versus what is offered. Is it possible for FGSR to have more influence in admittance?

Dr. Shirvani (Dean of FGSR) responded: You have raised a number of issues. Any financial offer made to a student is a binding contract on behalf of the University so it really has nothing to do with the professor, who is only acting as an agent for the University. This goes for all offer letters. It certainly represents a risk that there are so many types of offer letters and in trying to enforce details not in the offer letter. These things need to be normalized because of the risk. There will be a serious attempt at normalizing these letters of offer. As to every program having to offer financial support, we want that decision (to offer financial support) to remain with the programs. The programs are autonomous in terms of who and how many students they want to recruit and how they want to use their resources. Universities who try to enforce an institutional minimum standard fall into major financial issues (e.g. U of T). But we want departments to use resources to recruit high quality students so some “uniformitization” will take place.

Brent Epperson (Vice-President Labour) commented: Many concerns we’ve heard voiced at the GSA about the reorganization come from this idea of results based budgeting. In my interactions with the government I have realized that it is very fond of this direction. However, our concern is that in faculties like Arts that this is something that if not done correctly (i.e., faculties are not allowed to define their own quality measures), results based budgeting could cause a disadvantage, create a hierarchy of faculties, and lead to a focused university direction. This is a difficult position for the GSA to support because we represent all graduate students. How are you going to ensure a hierarchy of faculties is not created?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: What the University does is set aside funds to be used for particular purposes; these purposes are defined by our academic plan built upon the University’s vision. It defines what we do and why we do it. “Spending to purpose” is to ensure we deliver upon those things in our strategic and academic plan. Graduate studies is a high priority in that plan. The President feels we haven’t been spending to purpose, haven’t been producing the quality we are capable of. Important ground work has been done but we have still not got there – in terms bringing in students that are competitive in Tri-Council funding, and in terms of our students getting outcomes that they are pleased with regarding their graduate student experience. This means spending to purpose versus results based budgeting. In terms of resulting in an elitist and biased program towards professional groups, accrediting

bodies define their expectations clearly. This means we have few reservations about quality measures out of those programs. We have more concerns with thesis based programs which are more open-ended and less defined and have fewer quality measures. We are not trying to create a bias but we will look at excellence. Given the fact that we are talking about graduate programs and the flagship University of Alberta, a research intensive university, we shouldn't be ashamed about striving for excellence. We need to identify struggling programs, identify what resources we can provide to help them. We are mainly focused on how to bring more resources into the University versus defending what we already have.

Tessa Hawkins (Art and Design) asked: I am wondering when the last time a graduate student satisfaction survey was done or if a demographic survey was done and whether one should be done before moving forward.

Dr. Shirvani (Dean of FGSR): Yes in 2009. It was a national survey, which we shared with FGSR Council in 2010-2011. We are just going into a next round for the survey. We can certainly circulate it.

Monty Bal (CAL) asked: I am from the Faculty of Arts. In regards to the reconfiguration of Arts in the past year, it is clear that the administration of the faculty had a model in mind and students were brought in after. It seems like a similar trend is happening here. When did this process actually start so we know when we were brought in? Do you have a model you want to work with?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Dean) responded: When did we start? It was probably somewhere in the middle of August. In mid-August, Mazi and myself began talking about it because for seven years President Samarasekera has been saying we've got to get on it. Not only was the President pushing it but this question had come up in numerous forums. At the end of August, we initiated a series of meetings with all the Deans. Shortly after that (mid-September) we realized that to go to the next stage (consultation), we needed a human resource to do that. This was when we acquired Dr. Swindlehurst. At the same time we also met with President Bernier and the SU President. These meetings were all done in confidence because we might have found that we did not have support and so we would just close it all down. We received clear indication in these initial discussions that this was something that needed additional consultation. The consultation process was planned with Dr. Swindlehurst – about four weeks of consultation with more to come (until December 20th). As far as having

preconceived ideas, well we all have ideas about graduate student programs, graduate student supervision etc. We have our personal experiences guiding us moving forward. We also have a lot of information from the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) that publishes extensively about students across graduate schools in North America. This gives us good baseline data. This was not an out of the blue, spontaneous initiative but something deeply concerned with building a stronger program. We feel it is a reasonable timeframe.

Monty Bal (CAL) supplementary: When you presented to the Deans and Presidents, did you present something vague or something more detailed?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: We said we wanted to do something significant and transformative. We were not undertaking change for change sake; we are looking at how we can move to a new level in terms of the graduate student experience. We did use a few "straw men" ideas when we were talking with the Deans to gauge their response. In having those conversations we outlined some ideas but they were not conclusions.

Nathan Andrews (Vice-President Academic) asked: You said that some departments/faculties are not using the resources that they have. I find this surprising. Graduate students could use more funding so I am concerned that some students are not receiving what is available. Why was nothing done in the past?

Dr. Shirvani (Dean of FGSR): I started as the Dean in May 2008. FGSR had just finished a unit review. The review focused on the unit itself so it identified issues that had to be looked at, another committee was used to deal with the report. This resulted in more recommendations in 2009, almost all of which focused on internal changes needed for FGSR. This is what we've been working on. I cannot speak to the time before I came. Starting around summer 2011, I started to realize there is only so much unit reorganization you can do. Remembering that graduate programs are very decentralized, we started looking at the data around recruitment, graduate funding, etc. I did a presentation at the Deans retreat in August 2011 to bring a number of these issues to the attention of the other Deans. I have spent almost a year since then studying the issues specifically in great detail (e.g. grad student funding), and that is when I started identifying programs where not all resources are being used. So this all came out in last year, and we are now starting to do something.

Jean-David Jutras (Oncology) commented: We have two divisions in our department and they are run differently depending on their directors. Much of the power is wielded inside of the department so I don't think changes would be helpful for us. If it will be helpful to other departments then I think it will be great.

Huimin Zhong (Vice-President Student Life) asked: There are always costs associated with change. Do you have an idea of how these changes will be financed? Do you think graduate students will be responsible for part of the cost in terms of seeing an increase in tuition?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: We are not looking at this an initiative that is driving cuts or increases in tuition. We want to make sure tuition is reasonable and I am working with our VP Finance and the GSA President to not look at tuition in isolation but look at the total cost package of doing a graduate degree (i.e., the annual cost for completing a degree at the U of A). I genuinely think that we should do more with what we've got. There is absolutely no intention to cut the amount being spent on graduate education. I hope the measures we take will bring in more money through quality, better use of resources, etc. Even if in the next year we were to increase tuition, it will have not been the result of this initiative but of cost comparisons with other universities.

Amanda Lim (English) asked: FGSR plays an active role in collective bargaining. Given this role in collective bargaining undertaken in conjunction with the GSA, if major changes were to take place, what would the role of FGSR be in the collective bargaining process?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: I don't see the role changing.

Dr. Shirvani (Dean of FGSR) agreed.

Brent Epperson (VP Labour) commented: We have our first meeting with Jay Spark next week with regards to collective bargaining. I will keep Council informed each month as bargaining continues.

Ravi Singh (Business MBA) asked: In regards to quality measures, are we trying to bring in mandatory components like teaching or industry service into programs?

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: We see quality measures as made up of two components. Each faculty will be required to each year provide input on 5 measures common to all faculties then each faculty would also report on 3 measures they select. This would allow for comparison across programs but we do know there are significant differences in cultures across programs and we do want to capture that. We may have

more or less generic and specific measures depending on what the focus groups have to say. It will be up to the working groups to come up with the set of measures. This is a concept to be considered. Some quality measures will take a long time to come into effect, before we see a significant enough time for change to occur (e.g. success in Tri-Council funding). This means we need to balance other measures with more immediate indicators (e.g. how many students are involved in Tri-Council training programs). So we will have short-term measures with long-term benefits and associated measures. But again these will be up to the working group to select.

Dr. Shrivani (Dean of FGSR) responded: We can be creative with the quality measures; some will be quantitative, some will be qualitative. For example, departments can identify careers they are training their graduate students for, then we can see if they are providing opportunities/training for their students to pursue those careers. If they are only training professors then we need to make sure that all forms of training to produce successful future professors are in place. What sort of skills are departments providing? Rather than telling departments what to do, we want to have them tell us what they want to do, and then judge if they are doing what they say there are aiming at doing.

Brent Epperson (Vice-President Labour) commented: In talking with graduate students across the country, when there is a centralized unit like an FGSR leading professional development, there is greater satisfaction. McGill, for example, won an award for their program, Skillsets.

Dr. Ferguson-Pell (Acting Provost) responded: Administration gets that. We want to see more centralized programs, more centralized understandings of quality and of processes. We want to see effectiveness and accountability for facilities to deliver best practices. We do not want to see fragmentation. We do not want to see decentralization. There has to be accountability. We do need to enable subtle differences between programs to delivered locally but we also need to have local excellence.

Tessa Hawkins (Art and Design) MOVED to proceed to next agenda item. Nikolai Sinkov (Chemistry) SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ashlyn Bernier (President) expressed many thanks to the guests for answering questions.

6. Councillor Announcements

There was no material before members.

Prepared by K Biittner and C Thomas for GSA Council 10 Dec 2012

Nathan Andrews (Vice-President Academic) announced that the annual Trudeau Conference was happening Thursday through Saturday and provided posters for information and distribution. He invited all Councillors and graduate students to attend.

Roy Coulthard (Senator) MOVED to amend the approved agenda and to bring Action Item 16.i forward before reports. Nikolai Sinkov (Chemistry) SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

16. Action Items

i. **GSA 2012-2013 Budget and Expenditure (Quarterly) Report**

Presented by Ashlyn Bernier (President). Members had before them six documents, all of which had been distributed on 08 November 2012. In her presentation Ashlyn Bernier (President) noted:

- This is our second quarterly report; meant to provide Council with progress of how closely we are sticking to what we have budgeted, are we on target, over or under, and the reason(s) why. We have begun the process of budgeting for the next year. Feedback from the GSA BFC and GSA Council will be valuable. According to our accountant, we will achieve a balanced budget in 2012-2013. We are trying hard to prepare budgets looking long-term so that we do not require advances from the University.
- In your circulated material, you will find a letter from me, and from past President Roy Coulthard. I would like to ask him to provide some context.

Roy Coulthard (Senator) commented:

- In interests of brevity, I direct you to item 16.2, which has a series of events in a timeline that affected the GSA budget. Since 2006, through the efforts of the negotiations teams and various Vice-Presidents Labour, we have brought in over \$500,000 in University money that has been distributed to graduate students by the GSA in the form of grants of various types. What I would draw to your attention particularly is that throughout that entire period, despite the growth in graduate student numbers, there was no investment in infrastructure or long-term stability. Fee increases were typically well below what would have been required to keep things stable relative to the CPI. When we brought in Ellen, she asked what the GSA would need to be stable and keep a consistent voice at the table without twelve months for people to get up to speed. That is why three years ago we started to move towards

increasing fees and decreasing spending, based on efficiencies including grants administration. It was known to be a multi-year project. We were going from the point of being without staff support and constant turnover to being an organization with the support that we want, with streamlined function, and with advisory support to the elected officials. It is going to take at least another year so that we don't have to draw down our reserves annually.

Ashlyn Bernier (President) commented: I would also like to thank our financial team. Roy said it well – we have come a long way in the past few years. We are going to have to spend a lot of time and receive a lot of consultation this year to figure out what our budget needs to look like to maintain elected officials and the GSA as a stable and long-term organization.

Fred Wu (Speaker) opened the floor to Debate for or against the motion.
No debate.

Fred Wu (Speaker) opened the floor to Points of Information.

Roy Coultard (Senator) asked: What is the total value of the AEGS fund this year?
Ashlyn Bernier (President) responded: You will find this in the narrative. It is on Item 16.i, page 16 under restricted funding at \$514,000. We are also a point at which we can ask for increased funding as part of collective bargaining, which we are this year.

Ashlyn Bernier (President) MOVED that the GSA Council receive the attached GSA 2012-2013 Budget and Expenditure (Quarterly) Report for information. Colin More SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Following discussion of Item 16.i, reports were presented. *Note: the item numbers for the rest of the items were carried over from the distributed Agenda in these minutes to avoid confusion.*

7. President

i. President's Report:

Members had before them a written report, which had been distributed on 16 November 2012. In addition, Ashlyn Bernier (President) made the following comments:

- Tuition: At GFC APC last week, a motion was presented to increase tuition to 2.15%. This is still in the forefront of our minds. Councillors may have

read an article in a recent edition of the *Gateway* about a \$2,000 market modifier. There is a slim chance that it might come forward this year, but this is unlikely. The possibility remains that it might come forward again next year or the year after. We are being as active and involved in the conversation as possible.

- Udacity MOU: I don't know if any of you have read this MOU. Udacity offers a massive number of online courses. I was geeked out over this because I watched it signed between the U of A and a rep from Google. I think online courses are an interesting way to stretch yourself and learn something new. I am taking a computing science course right now, which is not something I had thought I would do.
- PAW: The groundbreaking ceremony was exciting, although I felt like I was stealing Roy's thunder because he spent two years advocating for it – I just want to recognize him.
- Budgeting: We have begun looking at budgeting for 2013-2014.
- Early Call: All are welcome to participate in the training sessions being offered regardless of whether or not you are interested in running for office. We will put out a formal call for nominations in the next few months.

ii. **GSA Board**

Members had before them a written report, which had been distributed on 16 November 2012. The report stood as submitted.

iii. **Budget and Finance Committee**

Members were directed to materials included under Item 16.i.

iv. **Governance Committee**

It was noted on the Agenda that no meetings were needed for the GSA Governance Committee that month.

v. **Nominating Committee**

Members had before them a written report, which had been distributed on 16 November 2012. The report stood as submitted.

8. Vice-President Academic

i. **Vice-President Academic's Report**

Members had before them a written report, which had been distributed on 16 November 2012.

In addition, Nathan Andrews (Vice-President Academic) noted the following:

- Time to Candidacy Rules in FGSR: This is an action item for recommendation to the FGSR Policy Review Committee on how to tighten the policy. They are trying to make it so that if you are in a program that has comprehensive exams, you have three years to do your candidacy, and two if there are no comprehensives in the department. The meeting is on Wednesday, so talk to me before then if you have any concerns with this item.
- Relocation Bursaries: The office is currently investigating relocation or resettlement bursaries on campus. How many of you have ever received one?

Response: Sociology

9. Vice-President Student Services

i. Vice-President Student Services' Report

Members had before them a written report, which had been distributed on 16 November 2012. The report stands as submitted.

ii. Student Affairs Advisory Committee (joint chair: Vice-President Student Life)

It was noted on the Agenda that no meetings were needed for the Student Affairs Advisory Committee that month.

10. Vice-President Student Life

i. Vice-President Student Life's Report

Members had before them a written report, which had been distributed on 16 November 2012.

In addition, Huimin Zhong (Vice-President Student Life) noted the following:

- Government of Alberta Citizenship Award: Nominees have been selected; their names have been provided in the ASC report (10.ii). We had 158 applications, so it was really competitive. I would also like to thank the ASC members, who put in more than 40 hours adjudicating the awards.
- Open Access: I was at a meeting about Open Access today, and they asked that we find out how many Councillors are familiar with Open Access and the services available on campus.

Response: NONE

ii. Awards Selection Committee

Members had before them a written report, which had been distributed on 16 November 2012. The report stood as submitted.

11. Vice-President Labour

i. Vice-President Labour's Report

Members had before them a written report, which had been distributed on 16 November 2012.

In addition, Brent Epperson (Vice-President Labour) noted the following:

- PC and NDP Events: At the PC event, I spoke to Ministers and backbenchers about market modifiers and FGSR reform. I specifically go to these lobby events to raise such issues. Any opportunity to remind government how many grad students there are in Alberta and our issues and opinions is important. I also attended an NDP event as it is important to try to advance student issues with all parties.
- Meeting with Councillor Iverson: He had a number of helpful suggestions regarding UPass.
- CAGS: Going was productive because you get the chance to talk usefully in a different context with your own Dean, where you can both compare and contrast. It is also useful for coordinating with other student leaders. Based on this experience I would make two suggestions:
 - That the U of A GSA attend the Western Deans Conference in Victoria scheduled for January. We know a lot gets done at the regional meetings in Canada, and we should attend; we are hoping that each of the GSAs will be able to attend;
 - That the GSA office look into the McGill Skillsets professional development program, which received good reviews from the Deans.
- CAGS, CUPE, CASA: Talks are in the preliminary stages, so I will keep Council informed.
- Meeting with Dean Shirvani: We resolved some labour concerns (most of which are in Engineering). We also discussed CAGS more. We are going to meet with Chairs throughout the Faculty of Engineering and possibly with the Dean of Engineering. We have the support of the Dean of FGSR for this. I will come back to you with a report in a few weeks.

ii. Negotiating Committee

It was noted on the Agenda that no meetings were needed for the Negotiating Committee that month.

iii. Labour Relations Committee

It was noted on the Agenda that no meetings were needed for the Labour Relations Committee that month.

12. Senator

i. Senator's Report

No report was required at this time; it was noted on the Agenda that the next meetings of the Senate are scheduled for December 6th and 7th. Roy Coultard (Senator) noted that he attended Senate Exec last week, and wanted to notify Council that this Fall Convocation will be the last grad only convocation as graduate students will now with convocate with their faculties. Councillors with problems with this should contact Roy.

13. Speaker

i. Speaker's Report

No report was required at this time.

14. Chief Returning Officer

i. Chief Returning Officer's Report

No report was required at this time.

ii. Elections and Referenda Committee

It was noted on the Agenda that the Elections and Referenda Committee would be meeting shortly to review policy.

15. GSA Management

i. Executive Director's Report

Members had before them a written report, which had been distributed on 16 November 2012.

In addition, Ellen Schoeck (Executive Director) noted the following:

- Pointed out proposal for new grants process; direct deposit thanks to the university, online form, one page – current century with respect to grants!

Action Items, Elections, Appointments, Special Business

17. Elections

No elections at this time.

18. Special Business

i. **CLE Subcommittee on Attributes and Competencies List of Attributes:**

Nathan Andrews (Vice-President Academic) presented the attached item for information. He noted that:

- If you looked at the attachment, the CLE subcommittee has come up with a list of seven semi-final attributes. What we are trying to do is move it to the CLE committee level. We have a draft with a preamble about the attributes, and then a discussion about how to implement. I will then come to Council to discuss implementation.

Question Period

19. Written Questions

No written questions were received prior to the meeting.

20. Oral Questions

No questions were asked.

Adjournment

Roy Coulthard (Senator) MOVED that Council adjourn to a social space. Ashlyn Bernier (President) SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46pm.

GSA President Report to Council

To: Council Colleagues
From: Ashlyn Bernier
Date: December 7, 2012

Dear Colleagues,

I can't believe 2012 is nearly over. This year has gone incredibly fast, especially at the GSA. We have had an interesting year, both from the perspective of the "day to day" activities we manage, such as Health and Dental, and more "unexpected" issues that have come our way, such as FGSR reorganization. It's an interesting exercise to reflect, and I am looking forward to my remaining time in office where I will strive to give issues such as these the attention they deserve.

Some key reflections and priorities:

GSA Health and Dental plan

This has been a unique year with regards to our Health and Dental plan, as we have changed insurance providers, from Sunlife to Desjardins. Our insurance broker, Studentcare, has been working closely with the GSA to address the concerns that have come forward. Many of the student concerns surround changes to the "formulary" between Sunlife and Desjardins – what drugs they cover, in what form and amount, etc. Although we have received several complaints, we have found that upon making them known to Studentcare, the students receive prompt attention and most matters have been resolved. If you have any questions or concerns about your GSA Health and Dental plan, please do not hesitate to contact Studentcare directly, or if you prefer, the GSA, and we can direct your questions to the appropriate person.

FGSR Reorganization

Last month, Drs. Ferguson-Pell and Shirvani spoke at GSA Council on this issue, and I must applaud Council and guests for their articulate questions that I believe truly got to the heart of the issue – What are "quality measures" and how can they be applied to fundamentally different programs of graduate education? What is the timeline for implementation? What is the goal of the consultation process? All of these questions are extremely important and I urge Councillors to continue to ask these questions at every opportunity. We will be inviting members of Senior Administration back to Council in the new year to speak on this, and will continue to update you on this matter, and inform you all of any opportunity that arises where you can learn more.

Early call for talent

The University of Alberta GSA is unique in Canada, and possibly North America, in the training program we offer to individuals interested in running for elected office. This program is meant to educate interested people on the structure and function not only of the GSA, but University governance in general. We feel that this will better prepare successful candidates for office, and also prepare those who do not end up taking office for other opportunities to get involved with the GSA. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you are interested in participating – to consider a position as an elected official or just to learn more about what the GSA does.

Until next time,

Ashlyn Bernier

The following is a list of meetings I attended between November 16 – December 5, 2012:

November 16	PAW Design Review
November 16	President's Town Hall
November 19	BoG University Relations Committee
November 19	BoG Learning and Discovery Committee
November 19	GSA Council
November 20	Honourary Degree Reception
November 21	PAW ACS/Security Review
November 21	GSA Board
November 21	Convocation
November 21	Honourary Degree Reception
November 23	Solider for a Day
November 26	Meeting with AVP Connor
November 26	Governance Letter Meeting with SU
November 26	General Faculties Council
November 26	BoG Dinner
November 27	Associations Meeting
November 27	BoG Finance and Property
November 28	Negotiations Pre-Meeting
November 28	GSA Board
November 28	GFC Academic Planning Committee
November 28	Early Call Dinner
November 29	Meeting with Dean FGSR
November 29	Campus Career Service Providers
November 29	Meeting with Dean of Students
November 30	Meeting with VP F and O
December 03	GSA Budget and Finance Committee Meeting
December 03	Meeting with Catherine Swindlehurst
December 03	Meeting with VP International
December 03	President's Holiday Open House
December 04	Meeting with Catherine Swindlehurst
December 04	Meeting with AVP Academic
December 04	Registrar's Selection Advisory Committee
December 05	Provost's Fellow on Graduate Supervision
December 05	GSA Board
December 05	China Institute Board of Directors

**GSA Board
Report to Council**

To: Council Colleagues

From: Ellen Schoeck, Executive Director and Coordinator of the GSA Board; Heather Hogg, Director of Operations; and Courtney Thomas, Associate Director.

Date: December 05, 2012

The Board reports regularly to Council by listing its agenda items, motions/agreements, and main items of discussion. Motions of Agenda approval and approval of the Minutes are not included unless there were amendments made. Closed session items are not minuted. The President, Vice-Presidents, Director of Operations, Financial Manager, and we will be happy to answer any questions or provide more information at the Council meeting.

November 14, 2012 GSA Board Meeting

Main Agenda Items: Residence Rate Increases, Town Hall, CAGS, *and* McGill Skillsets Program.

Motions and Agreements: None

November 21, 2012 GSA Board Meeting

Main Agenda Items: Studentcare Change of Coverage, PAW Planning Issues, Potential Membership in CASA or CFS, Graduate Student Tuition Data Committee Terms of Reference, *and* GSA Awards.

Motions and Agreements:

Board Members **AGREED** that if Board members ever receive student complaints about discrepancies in which drugs are being covered by the plan have the student contact Studentcare networks so that they can log and monitor these concerns.

Board Members **AGREED** that if any student Health and Dental Plan Concerns must be discussed at GSAB, the student needs to provide authorization that their issue can be discussed by this body.

AB MOVED that the GSA Board **recommend that the proposed revisions to the *Graduate Student Teaching Award and the Graduate Student Teaching Assistant Awards*, as outlined in the attached three-column document, be forwarded to Council for consideration.** The motion was seconded.
CARRIED.

November 28, 2012 GSA Board Meeting

Main Agenda Items: Provost's Graduate Student Funding Task Force and Graduate Student Tuition Data Committee, AEGS Fund Proposed Revisions, Associations Meeting, *and* possible APIRG referendum.

Motions and Agreements:

Board Members **AGREED** that they would focus holistic attention on the Graduate Student Tuition Data Committee, rather than the Graduate Student Funding Task Force, which is largely defunct.

AB MOVED that the GSA Board recommend that the proposed revisions to the *Grant Application Policy and Information*, as outlined in the attached three-column documents, be forwarded to Council for consideration. Seconded by NA. **CARRIED unanimously.**

**GSA Budget and Finance Committee
Report to Council**

To: Council Colleagues
From: Ashlyn Bernier, President and Chair of BFC
Date: December 4, 2012

Dear Colleagues,

The GSA BFC met on December 3, 2012 to discuss several issues including the University's recommendation on projected enrollment increases for budgeting purposes, the inflation factor for the 2013-2014 budget, the GSA's share of funds in the Unitized Endowment Pool, GSA Cash Flow, and a plan for management hiring/succession within the GSA office. The GSA BFC also considered the issue of Spring/Summer fees and decided the time was not right for a proposal to come forward but that further discussion should take place at subsequent meetings.

I would be happy to report further orally.

Respectfully,
Ashlyn Bernier, GSA President

**GSA NOMINATING COMMITTEE (NoC)
REPORT TO COUNCIL for December 10, 2012 Council Meeting**

To: Council Colleagues
From: Lacey Fleming, Vice-Chair of the NoC
Date: December 3, 2012

Dear Council Members,

The report from the GSA Nominating Committee is a summary of discussion/decisions the NoC has made since its last report together with a list of all vacancies filled.

The By-law governing the NoC is in Part VII, #11. Policy governing NoC begins on page 26 of the GSA Policy Manual.

As provided for in its terms of reference, the GSA Nominating Committee (NoC) has been conducting business via e-mail.

EARLY CALL FOR TALENT

According to the GSA Policy Manual, “the NoC will actively seek out potential candidates for all GSA Executive and Officer positions” (Nominating 6.4). ***The NoC has been very busy with early call for talent, which is a priority in the GSA Strategic Workplan for 2012-2013.*** Early call has received a significant response this year, with **12 students** expressing interest in the directly-elected officer positions!

On **November 6, 2012** the NoC sent out a call through the GSA Newsletter and the GSA Website to students interested in the directly-elected officer positions (GSA President, GSA VP Labour, GSA VP Academic, GSA VP Student Services, and GSA VP Student Life).

On **November 28, 2012** a get-to-know dinner was hosted by the GSA at Triffo Hall, where all interested students and incumbents met and discussed the GSA and directly-elected officer positions. The dinner was a great success!

A detailed **training program** for the early call for talent has started, the bulk of which will take place in December 2012 and January 2013. The program includes: individual meetings with the NoC Vice-Chair, Executive Director and interested students, tours of the GSA office, and sessions on: Governance 101, GSA 101, Strategic Plan 2012-2013, GSA Services, GSA Board and Consistent Messaging and Information Flow, and Budget 101 and Audit Basics.

DELEGATES SELECTED BY THE GSA PRESIDENT

For external committees that call for the GSA President, a Vice-President or Delegate in their Terms of Reference, the GSA President, in consultation with the GSA Nominating Committee, is able to select delegates to serve on these committees. Below is a summary of these decisions since the November Council meeting.

1) Festival of Teaching Steering Committee

Michael Ross (MSc Civil and Environmental Engineering), was appointed to serve on this committee as the GSA VP Academic's delegate.

BODIES EXTERNAL TO THE GSA

As noted above, Council has delegated to the NoC the responsibility of filling positions on all committees external to the GSA. Normally, all vacancies are advertised. According to the Policy Manual, "advertising may be waived in instances where, in the NoC's view, it is urgent to fill a vacancy."

1) Human Rights Lecture Selection Subcommittee

Due to urgency (i.e. this committee will be meeting very soon), advertising was waived. The NoC is currently approaching students from the Nominating Committee Bank of Names to select a suitable representative to serve on this subcommittee. **The subcommittee only meets once per year, to select the Lecturers for the University of Alberta Visiting Lectureship in Human Rights.**

**GSA Vice-President Academic
Report to Council**

To: Council Colleagues
From: Nathan Andrews
Date: December 7, 2012

Dear Councillors,

I hope most of you (or at least the men) had a wonderful 'movember'! It's been busy as always at the GSA and I did attend a number of meetings since my last report to council. But before I proceed to highlight a few items, here is a brainteaser: **Did you know that the policy of grading on a curve has been abolished?** Well, now you know! It appears some Professors may still be using the curve system, so please be informed and let your department colleagues know as well.

CTL Subcommittee on Attributes and Competencies (SAC)

I think Council has heard much about this subcommittee already so I will be brief. We finally developed a draft document (which is attached to Council package *for your information* as Item 19). This document was discussed at length at the CLE meeting last week (December 5) and we hope to bring the work of the subcommittee to a close sometime next year after we have figured out the actual use of the document we have developed. We did not get a feeling from CLE members that they wanted a prescriptive document – although everyone likes the idea of having such a list. I will keep Council apprised on what happens next.

Provost Fellow Advisory Meeting on Supervision

We had another meeting with Dr. Naomi Krogman, Provost Fellow in charge of graduate student and post-doctoral fellow supervision. After an hour-long discussion, these were the four main issues we identified as being the major concerns at the UofA:

- Lack of knowledge with collective agreement (we actually spent most of the meeting on this item).
- Delicate relationship between supervisor and student especially when student works for them as a TA/RA.
- Lack of communication around responsibilities.
- Lack of opportunities for professional development, particularly beyond the academic route.

Please note that I have requested that Dr. Krogman come to GSA Council to present some of her findings and open up for more insights from other graduate students. We (Ashlyn, Brent and I who attend these meetings with her) certainly cannot speak to the diversity of issues that may exist out there. She has tentatively agreed and Ashlyn said she will follow up on this.

There are several items out of my meetings but these are the two that I want to emphasize here. Please feel free to let me know if you have questions about any of the other meetings listed below.

Cheers,

Nathan Andrews
GSA VP Academic

The following is a list of meetings I attended between November 16 – December 5, 2012:

November 19	CLE USRI Working Group
November 19	Pre-Council Meeting
November 19	GSA Council
November 20	Meeting with AVP Connor
November 20	FGSR Caucus
November 21	Convocation
November 21	GSA Board
November 21	FGSR Council
November 21	Meeting with SU VP Academic
November 26	Meeting with AVP Connor
November 26	Governance Letter Meeting with SU
November 26	General Faculties Council
November 26	Advent Lessons and Carols
November 28	GSA Board
November 28	Early Call Dinner
December 3	GFC Exec
December 4	Meeting with Catherine Swindlehurst
December 5	Provost's Fellow on Supervision
December 5	GSA Board
December 5	GFC CLE

Vice-President Student Services

Report to Council

To: Council Colleagues
 From: Naseeb Adnan, VP Student Services
 Date: December 7, 2012

First I would like to thank the GSA elected officials and staff for their support and for filling in for me during my recent absence. This was, I am pleased to report, as a result of the recent birth of my second son.

I attended a meeting of the **University Research Policy Committee (URPC)** on November 30 where compliance was discussed, including financial conflict of interest and disclosure of financial interests issues. Other topics included discussion on a model for a university-wide research grant assistance program; the lower number of SSHRC PDF applications this year although quality of applications is good; India-based research project with UBC and UofT as partners (UofA will focus on water; UBC on sustainability and UofT on transmission of diseases); UofA as the only Canadian partner with Tsinghua University which has received significant funding from the Chinese government of which \$5M will be spent in energy sectors; Brazil's funding of 1000 PDFs this year and departments are urged to attract these PDFs by possibly offering top up funding.

As I reported last month, the recently negotiated **U-Pass** pricing for the next four years will now be going ahead for approvals through the various municipalities. ETS reports that the transit partners (ETS, Strathcona County, St. Albert) are all very optimistic that U-Pass will be approved by their respective councils during their budget meetings in December. Now that the U-Pass price has been negotiated, the four student associations still need to meet with the transit providers to discuss other existing terms and conditions in the contract. The intent is to bring a referendum question to Council in the new year.

Sincerely,

Naseeb Adnan

The following is a list of meetings I attended between November 16 – December 5, 2012:

November 15	U-Pass Admin
November 30	University Research Policy Committee
December 05	GSA Board

**GSA Vice-President Student Life
Report to Council**

To: Council Colleagues
From: Huimin Zhong, VP Student Life
Date: December 7, 2012

Dear Council Colleagues,

How time flies! As the fall term approaches its end, I hope all of you are doing well with your finals, thesis, and all the other academic work. I would like to thank you for all your involvement and contributions to the GSA council this semester and wish you a great holiday! For this month, I would like to bring the following points to your attention.

Firstly, we have proposed two revisions to the **Graduate Student Teaching Award** and the **Graduate Student Teaching Assistant Awards**, basing on the review of previous GSA VP Student Life Hillary Sparkes. The proposal is to delete one of the four criterions, “number and diversity of courses taught”, when adjudicating the awards. The rationale of removing this point is that graduate students’ teaching quality should not be penalized by the number of courses they are teaching, which is usually the decision made by multiple stakeholders.

Secondly, two proposals won the \$5,000 prize for the “**Heroes for Health Challenge**”. Last month, the awarded proposals were shared in The Healthy Campus Symposium, which is an initiative of University Wellness Services, Health Promotion & Work Life Services, and Recreation Services to encourage and showcase healthy campus project ideas about healthy eating, active living, and mental health from the university students and staff. If any graduate student is interested in this, please search the “Heroes for Health” in the Uof A website for more information.

Thirdly, the university is emphasizing the **mental health** of the whole community. As graduate students, we are facing multiple challenges from study, work and social life everyday. It can be very stressful sometimes. It’s beneficial for every graduate student to pay enough attention to his (her) mental happiness. There is a self-diagnose mental health test online on the UofA website. You’re encouraged to try it. Besides, all graduate students are able to access the Graduate Student Assistance Program (GSAP) provided by Homewood Human Solutions, which includes psychological counseling services. Please don’t hesitate to use this service when there is need. You can call them 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Lastly, the last adjudication of **Student Group Grants** for this term was finished last Friday. For this application period, we received more than forty applications in total. The applications came from diversified student groups that have members from graduate students. I encourage all graduate students pay attention to these grants and apply for them.

If you have any question or concern regarding the items above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Huimin Zhong

The following is a list of meetings I attended between November 16 – December 5, 2012:

November 19	TUC Open Access Working Group
November 19	Pre-Council Meeting
November 19	GSA Council
November 20	Alumni Christmas Event
November 21	GSA Board
November 22	GFC CLRC
November 22	GFC FDC
November 26	Human Rights Roll-Out Discussion
November 28	Early Call Dinner
November 29	Health Promotion Advisory Committee
November 29	Meeting with student representative
December 05	GSA Board

**GSA Vice-President Labour
Report to Council**

To: Council Colleagues
From: Brent Epperson, VP Labour
Date: December 7, 2012

Dear Councillors,

I attended several committee meetings in November and December.

BSHEC Report, November 20, 2012

- In camera session at beginning;
- VPL mentioned 2 graduate student complaints about sanding on slippery spots around campus, concerns that sanding had not been as effective as last winter;
- VPL gave safety moment presentation;
- Gordon Winkel recommended to VPL that the GSA complete a task/risk inventory, contemplating and anticipating risks associated with particular tasks;
- Wayne Renke recommended to VPL that the GSA consider online risks; for example, and websites by departmental GSAs or other student groups using the GSA name who may post libel or defamation;
- VPL thanks Gordon and Wayne for recommendations and agreed to include them in report and discuss with GSA Board;
- Jim Hole (Chair) and other members thanked VPL for presentation and congratulated the GSA on risk management efforts;
- Members discussed theft on campus and watched the new “Don’t Feed the Thieves” video;
- Fed government is asking each laboratory to be responsible for risk management and mitigating hazards, but university wants this to be an institutional responsibility instead of one for original laboratories, which the university does not see as manageable;
- The committee discussed mandatory training for supervisors of labs before certain research could be authorized, none of substance is in place;
- Workplace hazardous material information system training (WHMIST) is obligatory, but it only “scratches the surface” and the university wants to develop a more comprehensive training and risk management approach on this issue;
- Closed session discussion on health and safety incidents, reports on summer HUB Mall incidents.

Pre-Negotiations Meeting With Jay Spark and Susan Buchsdruecker-November 28

- University team=Jay, Susan, and Dean Shirvani;
- Needs formal mandate from Board Human Resources Committee for financials, not meeting before January 22;
- Formal proposal meeting on January 31st;
- Open to beginning “re-write” before January 31;
- Mutual interest in clearing up language of agreement, 2-3 meetings before January 31st;

- Actual negotiations would take place February, in time for March 11 Council;
- Trying to wrap up negotiations before March 11 Council;
- Jay suspects that 2-3 negotiations meetings will be adequate;
- Discussion of working on language in CA, improving knowledge and enforcement of CA, Article 16 complaints against faculty members who violate CA;
- Agreed that knowledge and enforcement of CA is a mutual concern, will work on together;
- Ashlyn discussed the funding task force, Heather discussed Parking Lot committee, concurred on need to continue and revive both;
- Agreed on 2-hour meeting before holiday break.

Meeting with Mazi, November 29

- Discussed GSA attendance of Western Deans Conference in Victoria, funding for attendance;
- Use of market-modifier money thus far;
- Was UBEF the best destination for market-modifier money? Perhaps unspent portion could be moved to GSA accounts?
- Presented amended document incorporating Joanna and René's suggestions vis-à-vis relief of GSA elected officials;
- Mazi agreed to speak to Registrar about new THES registration, confident this can be arranged;
- Discussed Civil Engineering, fixing/clarifying stipend rates across the board through collective bargaining; programming "smart forms" would prevent departments from under-paying students, will send e-mail to me and Heather explaining suggestion;
- Roughly 8,000 records in PeopleSoft university-wide, only 7 who could have possibly been underpaid, in 5 cases, gave wrong contract (TAP B instead of TAP A), will work with Jay to fix these cases;
- FGSR will continue to coordinate with GSA on problems of Collective Agreement knowledge and enforcement, first in the Faculty of Engineering, then other faculties;
- Mazi may advise Jay to develop this list annually in audit function to catch any breaches of contract (on paper) according to collective agreement;
- Brief discussion on collective bargaining negotiations and schedule, starting with language clarification and knowledge/enforcement of collective agreement.

Labour Issues

Heather and I continue to gather information on labour related concerns in the Faculty of Engineering in response to departmental GSA requests and an excessive number of labour related cases in that faculty. The first meeting with an Engineering department chair will take place in December. More meetings will be scheduled with department chairs next term. I will keep the GSA Council informed of concerns about awareness and enforcement of the AEGS CA in the Faculty of Engineering in each of my reports until the end of my term. Heather and I have had a larger than usual number of labour cases from across campus in recent weeks, ranging from supervisory disputes over contract interpretation and personality conflicts to alleged harassment and more banal collective agreement questions. Some of these cases have been

referred to FGSR or the Graduate Ombudsman. I will continue to assist graduate students as needed and refer them to the proper channels if their concerns fall outside of the VPL portfolio. The above synopsis of the November 28 pre-negotiations meeting with Jay and Susan serves as an update on collective bargaining. I will continue to update GSA Council on the progress of collective bargaining in subsequent reports. Councillors may of course contact me with any collective bargaining questions or recommendations. An LRC meeting to discuss collective bargaining will be scheduled once we receive the University's proposals.

Best regards,

Brent Epperson

The following is a list of meetings I attended between November 16 – December 5, 2012:

November 16	President's Town Hall
November 19	Pre-Council Meeting
November 19	GSA Council
November 20	Labour Meeting
November 20	BoG Safety, Health and Environment
November 21	GSA Board
November 21	FGSR Council
November 21	Labour Meeting
November 27	Associations Meeting
November 27	Labour Meeting
November 28	Negotiations Pre-Meeting
November 28	GSA Board
November 28	Early Call Dinner
November 29	Meeting with Dean FGSR
November 30	Student Meeting
December 4	Meeting with Catherine Swindlehurst
December 4	AGC Policy Meeting
December 5	Provost's Fellow on Supervision
December 5	GSA Board

GSA Chief Returning Officer

Report to Council

To: Council Colleagues
From: Daniel Prins, CRO
Date: December 7, 2012

Dear Council Colleagues,

The pace of work as CRO has been picking up over the past month. During this time, I've been focusing on several aspects of GSA elections:

1. Bylaw and Policy Review- I have been reviewing the bylaws and policies concerning GSA elections, with an eye to eventually bringing potential reforms to the Elections and Referenda Committee.
2. Preparation for 2013 Elections- with assistance from the Deputy Returning Officer and GSA office staff, I have begun preparation of a timeline for the 2013 GSA elections.
3. Referenda- as our upcoming elections will coincide with at least one referendum, I have begun to develop a new, streamlined process to bring a referendum question for the approval of Council and subsequent vote by all graduate students.

All of these tasks will be carried out with the guidance of the Elections and Referenda Committee, which will meet in early January.

As always, feel free to contact me with any questions.

Best,

Daniel Prins, Chief Returning Officer

GSA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
REPORT TO COUNCIL FOR December 7, 2012

Dear Colleagues,

My focus in this report concerns **budget forecasting**.

The GSA is new to modernized, professional budgeting and to a five-year rolling budget/business plan. **If you missed the Budget 101 session at the last Council, there will be a Budget 101 on Thursday, January 24, 2013 (11:00am - 12:00pm) and Friday, January 25, 2013 (2:00pm - 3:00pm) for those graduate students running for office next year. You are welcome to attend.**

To begin, we have a mere two years' reliable, historical information on GSA revenues and expenditures.

Let me first address revenue in a succinct fashion. We are fees-driven and thus base our budget on forecasted numbers of full and part-time graduate students. For the first time in three years, we have a firm number from the university with respect to forecasted growth in the graduate student population: 1%. As you have read in President Ashlyn's report, we also have a reliable inflation factor (based on Alberta CPI).

Now to expenditures and forecasting.

When you receive the next quarterly financial report in February, you will see that there are variances in a number of lines – some underspent, some overspent, but nothing untoward. **By next year (2013-14), when we have *three* full years' reliable expenditure information, our variances will settle. By 2014-15 we should have a firm grip on both revenue and expenditure and variances should be minimal except for the unexpected (e.g. a lawsuit).**

Our Accountant (Shirley Ball), Financial Manager (Dorte Sheikh) and I have spent considerable time developing recommendations for President Ashlyn, BFC and the Board as we forecast what we think we will realistically spend in each budget category. We are also redrafting the Budget Principles, Policies and Practices to better reflect what the GSA's current best budget practices are.

The GSA is evolving rapidly into a modernized budgeting system that will serve the GSA well into the future and allow the GSA to carry out its mandate under the *Post-Secondary Learning Act*.

As always the detailed management reports to the weekly Board meetings are attached so you can see in detail that the office has been working on.

Best,

Ellen Schoeck, Heather Hogg, Courtney Thomas, and the Financial Team

Executive Director, Director of Operations, and Associate Director Report to the GSA Board – November 21, 2012

Dear All,

Week in Review – Strategic:

- The **early call for talent** continues to draw interested students and **preparation for the 2013 Election** is ramping up, including the development of an Elections 101 and a draft work plan/timeline).
- The project of populating the **Provost's Focus Groups on Graduate Student Education** is ongoing.
- The process of **grants reform** continues and proposals for Board and Council are being developed. **Information-sharing agreements with the U of A and Studentcare** are being finalized.
- Preparations for a **December GSA BFC meeting** have begun and the financial team has begun meeting regularly as the **budget for the coming year** is prepared. Preparations for **December's meeting of Council** are poised to begin shortly.
- The **GSA's SWP 2012-2013 roll out continues** and we are keeping running lists of **strategic items to raise in regular meetings with key players**.

Week in Review – Office Operations:

- The office team was hard at work with **preparations for Council** and with assisting with revising **packages for graduate students who answer the early "call for talent."**
- Advertising via the newsletter has seen a **slight bump in the number of Child Care Subsidy applications** and the office team is engaged in processing those applications.
- Scheduling of elected officials remains very complex with Nathan, Brent, and Naseeb out of commission for limited periods!
- Planning for a **mini Winter Orientation** in January 2013 has begun.
- The **transition to Google Drive** is almost complete and a filing index for the new drive has been created and distributed among the office team.
- **Research on relocation assistance bursaries/funding offered to U of A students and by other U15 institutions** is ongoing and other research projects (getting information on McGill's Skillsets program, for example) are beginning.

Executive Director, Director of Operations, and Associate Director Report to the GSA Board – November 28, 2012

Dear All,

Week in Review – Strategic:

- Upcoming **potential GSAB agenda items**: Ashlyn will be away for GSAB on December 12, perhaps we could use the December 19 GSAB as a wrap up of 2012 session before the office closes on the 21st for Christmas? GSAB for January 2, 2013 will be cancelled and the mini Winter Orientation 2013 will be held in the afternoon. Budget and health and dental will start up again in January!
- Upcoming **potential GSA Council agenda items**: Health and dental in January, along with quarterly financial reports, and an update on the SWP. February and March will be budget, budget, budget (and Shirley will be away for the March budget meeting).
- The **early call for talent** is one of three top priorities.

Week in Review – Office Operations:

- The office team was hard at work with preparations for Council and post Council work (and Council meets again in less than 2 weeks) and with assisting with revising **packages for graduate students who answer the early “call for talent.”**
- Courts has been shadowing staff and receiving a ton of cross-training into other roles.
- Dyan was away for her convocation!
- Planning for a **mini Winter Orientation** in January 2013 has begun.
- The **transition to Google Drive** is now complete and a filing index for the new drive has been created and distributed among the office team. Several office computers have also been switched around to maximize efficiency.
- **Research on relocation assistance bursaries/funding offered to U of A students and by other U15 institutions** is ongoing and research on **McGill’s Skillsets program** has also begun.
- **Research on Open Access** is also underway.

Executive Director, Director of Operations, and Associate Director Report to the GSA Board – December 5, 2012

Dear All,

Week in Review – Strategic:

- Preparation of the **2014-2015 budget** are moving along excellently – Ellen and Ashlyn have been meeting with the financial team has been meeting regularly and, on Monday, December 3 and Monday, December 10 the GSA BFC will meet.
- The **early call informal dinner** was a great success – preparing refreshments in house saved the GSA hundreds of dollars and the turnout for the event was fantastic. The **early call for talent remains a top priority, alongside budget.**
- **Modernizing GSA services through fill-able forms and direct deposit**, as well as through the development of information sharing agreements, continues at a fast pace just ahead of the January 2013 implementation.

Week in Review – Office Operations:

- The office team was hard at work with assisting with revising **packages for graduate students who answer the early call for talent and well as with the planning for the early call informal dinner.**
- Courts has been shadowing staff and receiving a ton of cross-training into other roles. Both Courts and the staff training her have been instrumental in **ensuring the office runs at peak efficiency.**
- Planning for a **mini Winter Orientation** in January 2013 continues – the January 2 date means that all plans must be in place before the office closes for the holiday break.
- Preparations for **December GSA Council** are also underway.
- **Research on Open Access** is underway with a potential presentation for GSA Council in next term in the works. **Research on relocation assistance bursaries/funding offered to U of A students and by other U15 institutions and research on McGill's Skillsets program is ongoing.**

Outline of Issue

Grant Application Policy and Information: Proposed Revisions

Suggested Motion:

That the GSA Council approve, on the recommendation of the GSA Board, proposed revisions to the *Grant Application Policy and Information*, as outlined in the attached documents, effective January 1, 2013.

Jurisdiction:

GSA Bylaws (*relevant excerpts*)

Part I **AUTHORITY** [...]

2 Policy Manual

2.1 The Policy Manual shall contain all policies and procedures passed by Council except as contained in any other governing document.

2.2 The Policy Manual is under the jurisdiction of Council (Part III) and may be amended by a simple majority vote of Council at any meeting of Council. [...]

Part V **GSA BOARD** [...]

3 Mandate

3.1 The GSAB is the senior administrative authority of the GSA as delegated to it by Council. [...]

GSA Grants are outlined in the Policy Manual under “Grant Application Policy and Information” and are available for review at www.gsa.ualberta.ca/en/05Governance/~media/gsa/GoverningDocuments/PolicyManual.pdf

Policy Manual changes require approval at one meeting of Council (GSA Bylaw Part I, 2.2).

For Bylaws see www.gsa.ualberta.ca/en/05Governance/~media/gsa/GoverningDocuments/Bylaws.pdf

Background:

See attached documents outlining the rationale for proposed changes to the *GSA Grant Application Policy and Information* for the following funding programs:

1. Professional Development Grants
2. Child Daycare Subsidy
3. Lecture Grants
4. Student Group Grants
5. Emergency Bursaries

As the senior administrative authority of the GSA as delegated to it by Council, the Board considered these proposals at its November 28 meeting and recommended that the proposed revisions to the *Grant Application Policy and Information* be forwarded to Council for consideration. Upon approval, the revisions will be implemented effective January 1, 2013.

Do not be daunted by the length of the attached material. The triple columns are easy to read. The first column provides the current policy; deletions are indicated using a strikethrough. The second column contains the proposed changes; additions are underlined. Finally the third column provides the rationale for the proposed changes.

Prepared by H Hogg 29 Nov 2012

C:\Users\GSA User\Google Drive\320 - Council\December 2012\GSA Council 10 Dec 2012 Item 17 - Outline of Issue Proposed Revisions to AEGS Funding Programs.docx

Professional Development Grant: The following is an overview/summary of substantive proposed changes to streamline and improve the program. A three-column proposal detailing current and proposed policy is attached.

	CURRENT	PROPOSED	Comments/Rationale
1.	PDG program is in effect treated as a “travel expense reimbursement program.” Students must submit original receipts, and GSA keeps them.	PDG is treated as a “travel award” program. Students need not submit any receipts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is precedent for allocating funds without receipts. FGSR does this through its Travel Award program. Feedback solicited from FGSR indicates that the management of the travel program works well. It is a matter of thinking of the PDG as an award rather than travel expense reimbursement. • One of the rationales behind original receipts appears to be to prevent “double-dipping”; however, most receipts are electronic and can be submitted to several grants anyway; keeping originals disadvantages students who have paper receipts (especially those whose receipts cover a larger amount than our grant, but we keep them anyway). • Similar to the FGSR process, the supervisor’s confirmation of academic travel by the graduate student will credibly vouch for the student’s need. There is a further check since the GSA cc’s the supervisor when the graduate student is notified of a PDG.
2.	Application is a paper-based process.	Students apply online.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security considerations have been addressed. Online forms will be stored (as is the GSA website) on the UofA servers protected by the UofA Firewall & Network security; access to the GSA website and online forms requires a secure CCID and password. • Streamlined process for graduate students; eliminates trips to the GSA offices. • Online applications eliminate most data-entry and typos, reducing the need for cheque correction and saving staff time. • Graduate students who are abroad can apply easily from there. • As with other online applications, graduate students will be required to click on a declaration that all information is true and correct.
3.	Supervisors have to sign on a page of the paper-based application confirming travel of his/her graduate student to an academic activity.	Supervisors sign nothing. After students apply online, supervisors receive an email detailing the graduate student request	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students need not be in the same physical location as their supervisor. They can communicate by email or phone, and agree on a budget and short event description. • Students will be advised that the supervisors receive this information, which encourages accuracy from the start.

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg 29 Nov 2012

		for funding, and are asked to email back within one week to confirm information.	
4.	Successful applicants receive their PDG via production of a cheque which they then have to pick up.	Utilize the UofA infrastructure using its direct deposit system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will save the GSA substantial costs in time and resources in cheque production (including current stale-dated cheque issues). • Students no longer need to come the GSA to pick up cheques or have cheques mailed out. • HR will train staff in use of Smartform system for entering data and processing payment.
5.	<p>Demonstrated need currently allocated based on a relevance score to determine funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directly related gets 75% of need up to max. eligibility • Partially related gets 50% of need up to max. eligibility • Unrelated gets 25% of need up to max. eligibility 	Only one funding level: 100% of the shortfall up to the max. eligibility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vast majority of students and supervisors check the “directly related” box. • Even when that box is not checked, shortfalls are usually high enough that the final grant amount is still the current maximum of \$500. The degrees of relation add an additional step for students, supervisor and GSA staff without having a substantial effect on grant levels. • This is another part of the grant policy that sometimes leads to unpleasant conversations with students who did not realize only a certain percentage of the shortfall was covered, leading to requests to change the application, which uses additional staff time, rewriting of cheques, and a negative impression left with the student.
6.	PDG applications can be submitted 3 months before or after the conference or event.	PDG applications may be submitted no more than 6 weeks before or after the conference or event.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A shorter timeframe increases the certainty that the applicant will be attending the conference/event. Using FGSR travel award provisions as a model, they allow for applications to be submitted no earlier than 6 weeks before the travel date.

Statistics**2011 – 2012 Fiscal Year: GSA Professional Development Grants**

Total Amount of Funding: \$251,415

Total Number of Students Funding: 570

CLOSING DATA

Period 1 runs from: April 1 – July 31 (actual closing date: **July 29**)

Period 2 runs from: August 1 – November 30 (actual closing date: **November 03**)

Period 3 runs from: December 1 – March 31 (did not close early)

2010 – 2011 Fiscal Year: GSA Professional Development Grant

Total Amount of Funding: \$154,894

Total Number of Students Funded: 248

Proposed Changes to Grant Application Policy and Information: Professional Development Grant

Current Policy Manual (<i>Deletions noted by a strikethrough</i>)	Proposed Policy Manual (<i>New changes underlined</i>)	Rationale / Background
1. Professional Development Grant	1. Professional Development <u>Awards</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name change a result of information received from the UofA following its review of tax/compliance issues. FGSR refers to its travel funding as “travel awards”. Professional Development Grant (PDG) will change to Professional Development Award (PDA) throughout the policy.
1. Sponsor / Purpose	<i>No Changes.</i>	
<p>a. The Academically Employed Graduate Student (AEGS) fund is a benefit to all graduate students, provided by the Graduate Students’ Association (GSA) through negotiations for the Collective Agreement covering Academically Employed Graduate Students. The PDG, provided from the AEGS fund, allows graduate students to participate in professional development activities such as conferences, research trips, courses, etc.</p>	<p>a. The <u>Academic Employment of Graduate Students</u> (AEGS) fund is a benefit to all graduate students, provided by the Graduate Students’ Association (GSA) through negotiations for the Collective Agreement covering <u>Academic Employment of Graduate Students</u>. The PDA, provided from the AEGS fund, allows graduate students to participate in professional development activities such as conferences, research trips, courses, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Editorial (change to official name in CA)
2. Eligibility Criteria	<i>No Changes.</i>	
<p>a. Must be a member of the GSA at the University of Alberta and registered in a graduate degree program.</p>	<i>No Changes.</i>	
<p>b. The event must be relevant to the professional development of the graduate student with signed confirmation by (a) the Supervisor or designate (for thesis-based students); (b) the Advisor or Department Chair or designate (for</p>	<p>b. The event must be relevant to the professional development of the graduate student <u>with confirmation</u> by (a) the Supervisor or designate (for thesis-based students); (b) the Advisor or Department Chair or designate (for course-based students) supporting the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signature not required since confirmation will be by UofA email, with the implementation of online application.

course-based students) supporting the professional development activity	professional development activity	
c. Must have a Social Insurance Number (SIN) or Individual Tax Number (ITN) for non-residents in order to receive a PDG cheque.	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With moving to direct deposit designated GSA staff will be trained in using SmartForms and no longer needs to collect this information. .
3. Application Information	<i>No Changes.</i>	
a. PDGs are offered on a first-come, first-serve basis. See below	<i>No Changes.</i>	
b. The GSA will offer grants until allocated funding is expended in the specified period (i.e., April 1 – July 31; August 1 – November 30; December 1 – March 31).	<i>No Changes.</i>	
c. If all available funds have been expended in the specified period, no additional applications will be accepted during that period.	<i>No Changes.</i>	
d. PDG applications can be submitted three months before or after the conference or event.	d. PDA applications can be submitted <u>no more than six weeks before or after</u> the conference or event.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A shorter timeframe increases the certainty that the application will be attending the conference/event. Using FGSR travel award provisions as a model, they allow for applications to be submitted no earlier than six weeks before the travel date.
e. Graduate students are responsible for the completeness and accuracy of their application packages	<i>No Changes.</i>	
4. Applying for a PDG	<i>No Changes.</i>	
a. Application forms are available on the GSA website	a. <u>Applications must be completed online through the GSA website</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streamlined process for graduate students; eliminates trips to the GSA Office. Online applications eliminate most data-entry and typos, reducing the need for corrections and saving time. Graduate Students who are abroad can apply easily. As with other applications, graduate students will be required to click on a declaration that all information is true and correct.
b. Applicants must submit ONE copy of the	<i>Delete.</i>	

application package to the GSA Office		
5. Allocation Policy	<i>No Changes.</i>	
a. There is no limit to the number of PDG applications a graduate student can submit during his/her degree program. There is a maximum of one PDG grant for each specified professional development event	<i>No Changes.</i>	
b. A master’s student will be awarded up to a maximum of \$500 during his/her degree program	<i>No Changes.</i>	
c. A doctoral student will be awarded up to a maximum of \$1,000 during his/her degree program. (Doctoral students who reached their maximum PDG amount of \$800 under the previous policy are now eligible to apply for an additional \$200 in order to fully compensate for the difference between the old and new policies). A doctoral student will be awarded up to a maximum of \$500 in a fiscal year (April 1 – March 31)	<i>No Changes.</i>	
d. PDGs will be allocated based on the relevance score provided by the graduate student’s Supervisor/Graduate Coordinator in Section E of the application: Directly related to thesis/dissertation/project or program – 75% of demonstrated need up to the maximums stated in section 5b; Partially related to thesis/dissertation/project or program – 50% of demonstrated need up to the maximums stated in section 5b; Unrelated to thesis/dissertation/project or program and is of personal interest – 25% of demonstrated need up to the maximums stated in section 5b.	<u>d. Graduate students will be awarded their shortfall up to a maximum of \$500.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vast majority of students and supervisors check the “directly related” box. • Even when that box is not checked, shortfalls are usually high enough that the final grant amount is still the current maximum of \$500. The degrees of relation add an additional step for students, supervisor and GSA staff without having a substantial effect on grant levels. • This is another part of the grant policy that sometimes leads to unpleasant conversations with students who did not realize only a certain percentage of the shortfall was covered, leading to requests to change the application, which uses additional staff time, rewriting of cheques, and a negative impression left with the student.

<p>e. PDGs will be awarded only for reasonable and allowable expenses and must comply with University of Alberta Expense Reimbursement policies and procedures as outlined in University of Alberta Policies and GSA Grants: Professional Development Grant Application Policy and Information Procedures (UAPPOL) except for hosting expenses which are not eligible. <u>See UAPPOL</u>. In cases of dispute, the Vice-President Student Services will decide on allowable expenses.</p>	<p>e. PDAs will be awarded only for reasonable and allowable expenses, using the University’s regulations on allowable expenses as a guideline, except for hosting expenses which are not eligible. In cases of dispute, the Vice-President Student Services will decide on allowable expenses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is precedent for allocating funds without receipts. FGSR does this through its Travel Award program. Feedback solicited from FGSR indicates that the management of the travel program works well. It is a matter of thinking of the PDA as an award rather than an expense reimbursement • One of the rationales behind original receipts appears to be to prevent “double-dipping”; however, most receipts are electronic and can be submitted to several grants anyway; keeping originals disadvantages students who have paper receipts (especially those whose receipts cover a larger amount than our grant, but we keep them anyway). • Similar to the FSGR process, the supervisor’s confirmation of academic travel by the graduate student will credibly vouch for the student’s need. There is a further check since the GSA cc’s the supervisor when the graduate student is notified of a PDA.
<p>6. Appeals Policy</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	
<p>a. Any appeals of denied applications must be RECEIVED within ten calendar days.</p>	<p>a. Any appeals of denied applications must be received <u>by the GSA</u> within ten calendar days.</p>	<p>Editorial/Administrative</p>
<p>b. Appeals must state the grounds for the appeal in writing and be sent to the GSA (c/o GSA Grants Specialist).</p>	<p>b. Appeals must state the grounds for the appeal in writing.</p>	<p>Editorial/Administrative</p>
<p>c. Appeals will be reviewed at arm’s length by the Vice-President Student Services (or designate if required) and two GSA Councillors selected by the President (or Speaker if there is a conflict of interest). All decisions are final and binding. Appeal decisions will normally be made within 20 calendar days.</p>	<p>c. Appeals will be reviewed at arm’s length by the Vice-President Student Services (or designate if required) and two GSA Councillors (<u>including Speaker and CRO</u>) selected by the President (or <u>other elected official</u> if there is a conflict of interest). All decisions are final and binding. Appeal decisions will normally be made within 20 calendar days.</p>	<p>Administrative, to ensure arm’s length decisions.</p>
<p>7. Budget Allocation Policy [...]</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	

8. Office Procedures	<i>No Changes.</i>	
a. Applications will be reviewed by the GSA staff for eligibility and completeness (see Eligibility Criteria and other policies above) using the following checklist	a. Applications will be reviewed by the GSA <u>office</u> for eligibility and completeness (see Eligibility Criteria and other policies above) using the following checklist	Editorial/Administrative
i. The application form is complete and required documentation has been submitted;	i. The application <u>information is complete and required documentation has been submitted or confirmed;</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online application process
ii. The applicant has confirmed she/he is a current member of the GSA and is in a graduate degree program;	<i>No Changes.</i>	
iii. The application has the appropriate signature (Supervisor/Advisor/Department Chair or designate) supporting the grant application	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervisors sign nothing. After students apply online, supervisors receive an email detailing the graduate student request for funding, and are asked to email back within one week to confirm information. • Students need not be in the same physical location as their supervisor. They can communicate by email or phone, and agree on a budget and short event description. • Students will be advised that the supervisors receive this information, which encourages accuracy from the start.
iv. There are sufficient funds available in the PDG budget in the specified period that the application is received;	<i>No Changes.</i>	
v. The appropriate criteria in the Allocation Policy (Section 5) have been met; and	<i>No Changes.</i>	
vi. Expense claims comply with University of Alberta Expense Reimbursement policies and procedures.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Section 5e. above for rationale / background
b. The graduate student submitting the application will be contacted via email by the GSA Grants Specialist (or other designated staff member) regarding applications that are	b. <u>The GSA will contact by email the graduate student submitting the application</u> regarding applications that are ineligible or incomplete in order to provide an opportunity to resolve the issue where possible.	Editorial/Administrative

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg 298 Nov 2012

ineligible or incomplete in order to provide an opportunity to resolve the issue where possible.		
c. All applications will be reviewed and signed off by the Vice-President Student Services or the Vice-President Student Life (or designate).	<i>No Changes.</i>	
d. Applicants who meet eligibility requirements will be notified by the GSA Grants Specialist via email of the pre-approved amount.	d. <u>Applicants will be notified by the GSA by email once processing has been completed and a decision has been made.</u>	Editorial/Administrative
e. Once receipts are received by the GSA Grants Specialist, the application documents and receipts will be forwarded to the GSA.	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receipts will no longer be collected. • See Section 5e. above for rationale / background
9. Interpretation of PDG Policy [...]	<i>No Changes.</i>	
10. Changes to Policy & Forms	10.Changes to <u>PDA Policy</u>	
a. The application policy, information, and forms are subject to GSA Council approval and cannot be changed without Council’s approval — excluding editorial revisions/clarification.	a. <u>PDA policy is</u> subject to GSA Council approval and cannot be changed without Council’s approval — excluding editorial revisions/clarification.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will no longer be forms; policy changes remain subject to Council approval.

Child Daycare Subsidy: The following is an overview/summary of substantive proposed changes to streamline and improve the program. A three-column proposal detailing current and proposed policy is attached.

	Current	Proposed	Comments/Rationale
1.	Application is a paper-based process.	Students apply online.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security considerations have been addressed. Online forms will be stored (as is the GSA website) on the UofA servers protected by the UofA Firewall & Network security; access to the GSA website and online forms requires a secure CCID and Password. • Streamlined process for graduate students; eliminates trips to the GSA office to drop off applications. • Online applications minimize most data-entry typos, reducing the need for cheque correction and saving staff time. • As with other online applications, graduate students will be required to click on a declaration that all information is true and correct.
2.	Successful applicants receive their CCS via production of a cheque which they then have to pick up.	Utilize the UofA infrastructure using its direct deposit system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will save the GSA substantial costs in time and resources in cheque production (including current stale-dated cheque issues). • Students no longer need to come to the GSA to pick up cheques or have cheques mailed out. • HR will train staff in use of Smartform system for entering data and processing payment.
3.	Must have applied for the Province of Alberta Child Care Subsidy. Proof of the grant or refusal of the Provincial Subsidy must be supplied in the application.	Delete this line completely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International students are not eligible to apply for the provincial subsidy, making them go through this process just to get a rejection letter is an unnecessary step. • We no longer look at this line when determining funding. Current funding is based on the number of children; 1 child = \$500, 2 children = \$1,000, etc. • This was overlooked when CCS criteria were revised last year and should have been eliminated at that time.

	Current	Proposed	Comments/Rationale
4.	Currently we fund \$500 per child with a maximum of \$2,000 annually. Grad students can only apply once in any given year.	Increase the amount to \$1,000 annually.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2011-12 we provided \$97,655 to 50 students (budget was \$83,227). • In March 2012 in view of demand on budget, CCS policy was reformed, (eg, limiting CCS application to one per year and \$500/child) to spread benefit to more graduate students. • 2012-13 Budget is \$105,000. • <i>From April 1 – Oct 16 (6.5 months through the fiscal year) only \$28,750 has been allocated and only 49 applications received, leaving a balance of \$76,250 to be distributed in the next 5.5 months. During CCS reforms made last year, we may now have made requirements too restrictive. Need more flexibility to increase maximum amounts based on demand in any given period.</i>
5.	Children must be enrolled in a provincially (Alberta) registered daycare, dayhome, or afterschool program. Proof of enrollment is required.	Only require proof of low income threshold and dependent eligible children.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more inclusive policy that will accommodate graduate students with children for whom a “traditional” daycare is not financially viable or where other valid child care options are available. • Eligibility criteria will still include low income threshold, household size, and number of eligible children.

Statistics

2011 – 2012 Fiscal Year: GSA Child Care Subsidy

Total Amount of Funding: \$97,655

Total Number of Students Funded: 50

Closing Data

Period 1 runs from: April 1 – July 31 (actual closing date: **July 13**)

Period 2 runs from: August 1 – November 30 (actual closing date: **September 09**)

Period 3 runs from: December 1 – March 31 (actual closing date: **December 07**)

2010 – 2011 Fiscal Year: GSA Child Care Subsidy

Total Amount of Funding: \$51,209

Total Number of Students Funded: 48

Prepared By C Germain/H Hogg 29 Nov 2012

C:\Users\GSA User\Downloads\Child Care Subsidy Streamlining Proposals.docx

Proposed Changes to Grant Application Policy and Information: Child Daycare Subsidy

Current Policy Manual (<i>Deletions noted by a strikethrough</i>)	Proposed Policy Manual (<i>New changes underlined</i>)	Rationale / Background
2. Child Daycare Subsidy	2. Child <u>Care Grants</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name change a result of information received from the UofA following its review of tax/compliance issues. Child Daycare Subsidy (CCS) will change to Child Care Grant (CCG) throughout the policy.
1. Sponsor / Purpose	<i>No Changes.</i>	
<p>a. The Academically Employed Graduate Student (AEGS) fund is a benefit to all graduate students, provided by the Graduate Students' Association (GSA) through negotiations for the Collective Agreement covering Academically Employed Graduate Students. The CCS, provided from the AEGS fund, helps offset the cost of child care for graduate students at the University of Alberta</p>	<p>a. The <u>Academic Employment of Graduate Students</u> (AEGS) fund is a benefit to all graduate students, provided by the Graduate Students' Association (GSA) through negotiations for the Collective Agreement covering <u>Academic Employment of Graduate Students</u>. The <u>CCG</u>, provided from the AEGS fund, helps offset the cost of child care for graduate students at the University of Alberta</p>	Editorial (change to official name in CA)
2. Eligibility Criteria	<i>No Changes.</i>	
<p>a. Must be a member of the GSA at the University of Alberta and registered in a graduate degree program.</p>	<i>No Changes.</i>	
<p>b. A graduate student applicant on leave does not qualify for a CCS.</p>	<i>No Changes.</i>	
<p>c. Must have applied for the Province of Alberta Child Care Subsidy. Proof of the grant or refusal of the Provincial Subsidy must be supplied in the application.</p>	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> International students are not eligible to apply for the provincial subsidy, making them go through this process just to get a rejection letter is an unnecessary step. We no longer look at this line when determining funding. Current funding is based on the number of children.

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg 29 Nov 2012

C:\Users\GSA User\Downloads\Child Care Subsidy Application Changes 3-column.docx

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This was overlooked when CCS criteria were revised last year and should have been eliminated at that time. 												
d. Eligible children include	<i>No Changes.</i>													
i. Those up to, and including, 12 years of age; and/or	<i>No Changes.</i>													
ii. A dependent child with special needs up to 18 years of age	<i>No Changes.</i>													
e. Children must be enrolled in a provincially (Alberta) registered daycare, dayhome, or after-school program. Proof of enrollment is required	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We propose to accommodate those families for whom a “traditional” daycare is not either financially viable or where other valid child care options are available. The GSA does not feel it is in a position to dictate or influence what constitutes appropriate child care. Eligibility criteria will still include low income threshold, household size, and number of eligible children. 												
f. Total gross household income cannot exceed the cut-offs listed below. Applicants paying their own tuition fees may deduct these fees from the total income:	<i>No Changes (this is still the last published data).</i>													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Household size (adults + children)</th> <th>Low Income Measure [Cut-Off] (2009)¹</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>\$30,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>\$37,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>\$43,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>\$48,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>\$50,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Household size (adults + children)	Low Income Measure [Cut-Off] (2009) ¹	2	\$30,000	3	\$37,000	4	\$43,000	5	\$48,000	6	\$50,000		
Household size (adults + children)	Low Income Measure [Cut-Off] (2009) ¹													
2	\$30,000													
3	\$37,000													
4	\$43,000													
5	\$48,000													
6	\$50,000													
g. In two-parent families, both parents must be students or the nonstudent parent must be working a minimum of 15 hours per week.	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To accommodate those families for whom daycare is not either financially available or where other equally valid child care options are available (e.g. It may be more viable for a parent to stay at home full-time to care for their child.) Eligibility for a Child Care Grant to be based on low income, household size, and number of eligible children. 												
h. Must have a Social Insurance Number (SIN) or Individual Tax Number (ITN) for	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With moving to direct deposit the GSA will be trained in using SmartForms and no longer needs to collect this 												

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg 29 Nov 2012

<p>non-residents in order to receive a CCS cheque.</p>		<p>personal information. The UofA will also be producing T4A's.</p>
<p>3. Application Information</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	
<p>a. CCSs are offered on a first-come, first-serve basis. See below</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	
<p>b. The GSA will offer grants until allocated funding is expended in the specified period (i.e., April 1 – July 31; August 1 – November 30; December 1 – March 31)</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	
<p>c. If all available funds have been expended in the specified period, no additional applications will be accepted during that period.</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	
<p>d. Eligible applicants may apply for one CCS in each GSA fiscal year (April 1 to March 31) and the CCS will be a maximum of \$500 per child, with a total maximum \$2,000 CCS in each fiscal year</p>	<p>d. Eligible applicants may apply for one <u>CCG</u> in each GSA fiscal year (April 1 to March 31) and the <u>CCG will be a maximum of \$1,000 per child in each fiscal year.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2011-12 we provided \$97,655 to 50 students (budget was \$83,227). • In March 2012 in view of demand on budget, CCS policy was reformed, (eg, limiting CCS application to one per year and \$500/child) to spread benefit to more graduate students. • 2012-13 Budget is \$105,000. • <i>From April 1 – Oct 16 (6.5 months through the fiscal year) only \$28,750 has been allocated and only 49 applications received, leaving a balance of \$76,250 to be distributed in the next 5.5 months. During CCS reforms made last year, we may now have made requirements too restrictive. Need more flexibility to increase maximum amounts based on demand in any given period.</i> • <i>If we find that we are receiving more applications than funds, we would be in a good position to request additional AEGS funds.</i>

e. Graduate students are responsible for the completeness and accuracy of their application packages	e. Graduate students are responsible for the completeness and accuracy of their <u>application</u> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move to online application.
4. Applying for a CCS	<i>No Changes.</i>	
a. Application forms are available on the GSA website	a. <u>Applications must be completed online through the GSA website</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streamlined process for graduate students; eliminates trips to the GSA Office. • Online applications eliminate most data-entry and typos, reducing the need for corrections and saving time. • Graduate Students who are abroad can apply easily. • As with other applications, graduate students will be required to click on a declaration that all information is true and correct.
b. Applicants must submit ONE copy of the application package to the GSA Office.	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move to online application.
5. Allocation Policy	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Section no longer required, as noted below.</i>
a. There is no limit to the number of CCS applications a graduate student can submit during his/her degree program (see 3.d.)	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not required, see 3.d.
b. No rollover shall occur between application periods	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are only eligible to apply once per fiscal year, see 3.d. • This policy dates back to when applicants could apply once per period.
c. Graduate students are responsible for the full cost of their child (ren)'s care in the child care facility regardless of whether or not their subsidy is approved.	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed policy changes no longer require the child to be in a "traditional" child care facility.

<p>d. The duration of the CCS is dependent on a number of factors including, but not limited to, the timing of an application within the specified CCS application period, the status of the child(ren)'s registration, and overall eligibility as determined through the application</p>	<p><i>Delete.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed policy changes no longer require the child to be in a “traditional” child care facility. Section 2 states the eligibility requirements of the children. This policy dates back to when applicants could apply once per period.
<p>6. Appeals Policy</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	
<p>a. Any appeals of denied applications must be RECEIVED within ten calendar days.</p>	<p>a. Any appeals of denied applications must be received <u>by the GSA</u> within ten calendar days.</p>	<p>Editorial/Administrative</p>
<p>b. Appeals must state the grounds for the appeal in writing and be sent to the GSA (c/o GSA Grants Specialist).</p>	<p>b. Appeals must state the grounds for the appeal in writing.</p>	<p>Editorial/Administrative</p>
<p>c. Appeals will be reviewed at arm’s length by the Vice-President Student Services (or designate if required) and two GSA Councillors selected by the President (or Speaker if there is a conflict of interest). All decisions are final and binding. Appeal decisions will normally be made within 20 calendar days.</p>	<p>c. Appeals will be reviewed at arm’s length by the Vice-President Student Services (or designate if required) and two GSA Councillors (<u>including Speaker and CRO</u>) selected by the President (or <u>other elected official</u> if there is a conflict of interest). All decisions are final and binding. Appeal decisions will normally be made within 20 calendar days</p>	<p>Administrative, to ensure arm’s length decisions.</p>
<p>7. Budget Allocation Policy [...]</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	
<p>8. Office Procedures</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	
<p>a. Applications will be reviewed by the GSA staff for eligibility and completeness (see Eligibility Criteria and other policies above) using the following checklist:</p>	<p>Applications will be reviewed by the GSA <u>office</u> for eligibility and completeness (see Eligibility Criteria and other policies above) using the following checklist:</p>	<p>Editorial/Administrative</p>
<p>i. The application form is complete and required documentation has been submitted;</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	
<p>ii. The applicant has confirmed she/he is a current member of the GSA and is in a graduate degree program;</p>	<p><i>No Changes.</i></p>	

iii. There are sufficient funds available in the CCS budget in the specified period that the application is received; and	<i>No Changes.</i>	
iv. The appropriate criteria in the Allocation Policy (Section 5) have been met.	<i>Delete.</i>	Section 5 has been deleted since is no longer required.
b. The graduate student submitting the application will be contacted via email by the GSA Grants Specialist (or other designated staff member) regarding applications that are ineligible or incomplete in order to provide an opportunity to resolve the issue where possible	b. <u>The GSA will contact by email the graduate student submitting the application</u> regarding applications that are ineligible or incomplete in order to provide an opportunity to resolve the issue where possible	Editorial/Administrative
c. All applications will be reviewed and signed off by the Vice-President Student Services or the Vice-President Student Life (or designate).	<i>No Changes.</i>	
d. Successful applicants will be notified by the GSA Grants Specialist via email once a CCS cheque has been issued.	d. <u>Applicants will be notified by the GSA by email once processing has been completed and a decision has been made.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate students will no longer come to the office to pick up cheques. All applicants are notified of decision. • The GSA will be utilizing the UofA infrastructure using its direct deposit system.
9. Interpretation of CCS Policy [...]	<i>No Changes.</i>	
10. Changes to Policy & Forms	10. Changes to <u>CCG Policy</u>	
a. The application policy, information, and forms are subject to GSA Council approval and cannot be changed without Council's approval — excluding editorial revisions/clarifications.	a. <u>CCG policy is</u> subject to GSA Council approval and cannot be changed without Council's approval — excluding editorial revisions/clarification.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will no longer be forms; policy changes remain subject to Council approval.

Student Group Grants and **Lecture Grants**: The following is an overview/summary of substantive proposed changes to streamline and improve the program. A three-column proposal detailing current and proposed policy is attached.

Overview:

Funding for these grants comes from year-to-year soft funding from the Provost. Upon request of the GSA President, the Provost provided \$25,000 funding to the GSA for academically-related student group activities for 2011-12 and again in 2012-13. In addition to supporting registered graduate student groups through LGs and SGGs, this fund also provides for Councillor remuneration (funding based on Councillor attendance that goes to the departmental graduate student group).

Currently SGGs are defined as enabling “registered graduate student groups to help support the costs of seminars, colloquia, or other academic events.” LGs are defined as enabling “graduate student groups to invite individuals recognized in their field to speak at the University of Alberta.” In 2011-12, \$18,898 was allocated in LG’s providing funding for 17 different graduate student groups and \$2,500 in SGG’s provided funding for 9 different graduate student groups (*4 of the groups applying for a LG also applied for a SGG for the same event*) for a combined funding of 23 different graduate student groups.

The proposal is now to streamline by merging the *Academically-Related Student Group Grant* and *Lecture Grant* into one grant to be referred to as the *Academically-Related Student Group Award (ASGA)*. Since both grants are only available for academically-related events to registered graduate student groups; these groups often apply for to both grants for the same event (*45% of SGG applications were for the same event as a LG application*).

	Current	Proposed	Comments/Rationale
1.	Separate programs	Merge two programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streamline programs since both programs must be used for academically-related activities.
2.	LG & SGG is in effect treated as a “reimbursement program.” Grad student groups must submit original receipts, and GSA keeps them.	The application is treated as an “award” program. Grad student groups need not submit any receipts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is precedent for allocating funds without receipts. FGSR does this through its Travel Award program. Feedback solicited from FGSR indicates that the management of the travel program works well. It is a matter of thinking of the SGLG as a bursary rather than an expense reimbursement. One of the rationales behind original receipts appears to be to prevent “double-dipping”; however, most receipts are electronic and can be submitted to several grants anyway; keeping originals disadvantages groups who have paper receipts (especially those whose receipts cover a larger amount than our grant, but we keep them anyway). Groups that apply for the LG and SGG for the same event often have to break up receipts to cover the amount funded for each grant. Similar to the FSGR process, the chairs/delegates confirmation of an academically-related event hosted by the graduate student group will credibly vouch for the groups need. There is a further check since the

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg 29 Nov 2012

			GSA cc's the chair/delegate when the graduate student group is notified of an SGLG.
3.	Application is a paper-based process.	Students apply online.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streamlined process for graduate students; eliminates trips to the GSA office. Online applications minimize most data-entry and typos, reducing the need for cheque correction and saving staff time. As with other online applications, graduate students will be required to click on a declaration that all information is true and correct.
4.	Department chair (or designate) has to sign on a page of the paper-based application declaring that event is an academic activity.	After students apply online, department chair or graduate chair receives an email detailing the graduate student request for funding, and are asked to email back within one week to confirm information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students need not be in the same physical location as their chair. They can communicate by email or phone, and agree on a budget and short event description. Students will be advised that the department chair/graduate chair will receive this information, which encourages accuracy from the start.
5.	Applications can be submitted four months before or after the event	Applications may be submitted no more than 6 weeks before or after the event.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A shorter timeframe increases the certainty that the event will take place. Note: This will not be a direct deposit process – GSA will make cheques out to the registered graduate student group.
6.	LG – allocated at 75% of demonstrated need...up to a maximum of \$1,500/yr SGG – allocated at 75% of demonstrated need...up to a maximum of \$200	Groups all eligible to apply for a maximum of \$1,500/yr. Only one application is permitted per event.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This allows graduate student groups to apply for multiple smaller events such as lunch seminars, or large events such as visiting lecturers. By providing funding to a larger number and variety of events we will be in a better position to persuade the UofA to provide additional funding in future years. With a combined \$20,500 in funding we would be able to fund 20-30 graduate student groups.

Statistics

Budget 2011-12: \$25,000 (\$4,500 Council Remuneration; \$18,000 LG; \$2,500 SGG)

2011 – 2012 Fiscal Year: GSA Lecture Grant

Total Amount of Funding: \$18,138.40

Total Number of Students: 16

Average Amount of Funding: \$1,133.65 / Group

CLOSING DATA 2011-12

Period 1 runs from: April 1 – July 31 (actual closing date: **July 13**)

Period 2 runs from: August 1 – November 30 (did not close early)

Period 3 runs from: December 1 – March 31 (did not close early)

2010 – 2011 Fiscal Year: GSA Lecture Grant

Total Amount of Funding: \$26,883.18

Total Number of Student Groups Funded: 24

Average Amount of Funding: \$1120.13 / Group

2011 – 2012 Fiscal Year: GSA Academically-Related Student Group Grant

Total Amount of Funding: \$1, 130.50

Total Number of Students Groups Funded: 6

Average Amount of Funding: \$200 / Group

CLOSING DATA 2011-12

Period 1 runs from: April 1 – July 31 (did not close early)

Period 2 runs from: August 1 – November 30 (did not close early)

Period 3 runs from: December 1 – March 31 (did not close early)

2010 – 2011 Fiscal Year: GSA Academically-Related Student Group Grant

Total Amount of Funding: \$3,400.00

Total Number of Students Groups Funded: 17

Average Amount of Funding: \$200 / Group

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg 29 Nov 2012

C:\Users\GSA User\Downloads\SGG and LG Streamlining Proposals.docx

Proposed Changes to Grant Application Policy and Information: Lecture Grants and Student Group Grants

Current Policy Manual (<i>Deletions noted by a strikethrough</i>)	Proposed Policy Manual (<i>New changes underlined</i>)	Rationale / Background
---	--	------------------------

3. Lecture Grants	4. Student Group Grants	3. <u>Academically-Related Student Group Awards</u>	Both grants have been merged .
1. Sponsor / Purpose	1. Sponsor / Purpose	1. <u>Sponsor / Purpose</u>	
<p>a. The Graduate Students' Association (GSA) Lecture Grants (LG) are awarded through funds provided to the GSA from the Provost for academically-related student group activities. LGs enable graduate student groups to invite individuals recognized in their fields to speak at the University of Alberta (U of A).</p>	<p>a. Student Group Grants (SGG) are awarded through funds provided to the Graduate Students' Association (GSA) from the Provost to support academic activities of student groups. SGGs enable registered graduate student groups to help support the costs of seminars, colloquia, or other academic events.</p>	<p>a. <u>The Graduate Students' Association (GSA) Academically-related Student Group Award (ASGA) is provided through funds from the Provost to support academic activities of graduate student groups by providing funding towards the costs of seminars, guest lecturers, colloquia or other academic events.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
2. Eligibility Criteria	2. Eligibility Criteria	2. <u>Eligibility Criteria</u>	
<p>a. Must be registered as a graduate student group through Student Group Services, SUB.</p>	<p>a. Must be registered as a graduate student group through Student Group Services, SUB.</p>	<p>a. <u>Must be registered as a graduate student group through Student Group Services.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
<p>b. The graduate student group must confirm that the lecture for which the funding is requested is an academic event.</p>	<p>b. The graduate student group must confirm that the event for which the funding is requested is academic in nature.</p>	<p>b. <u>The graduate student group must confirm that the event for which the funding is requested is academic in nature.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg for 29Nov 2012

<p>e. Requires signed confirmation of a Department Chair (or designate) attesting that the function is an academically-related activity and that he/she supports the event.</p>	<p>e. Requires signed confirmation of a Department Chair (or designate) attesting that the function is an academically-related activity and that he/she supports the event.</p>	<p>c. <u>Requires confirmation of the Department Chair (or designate) attesting that the function is an academically-related activity and that he/she supports the event</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant. In addition, after students apply online, department chair or graduate chair receives an email detailing the graduate student request for funding, and are asked to email back within one week to confirm information.
<p>d. The graduate student group is responsible for the completeness of their application package.</p>	<p>d. The graduate student group is responsible for the completeness of their application package.</p>	<p>d. <u>The graduate student group is responsible for the completeness of their application.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
<p>3. Application Information</p>	<p>3. Application Process</p>	<p>3. <u>Application Process</u></p>	
<p>a. LGs are offered on a first-come, first-serve basis.</p>	<p>a. SGGs are offered on a first-come, first-serve basis.</p>	<p>a. <u>ASGAs are offered on a first-come, first-serve basis.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
<p>b. The GSA will offer grants until allocated funding is expended in the specified period (i.e., April 1 – July 31; August 1 – November 30; December 1 – March 31).</p>	<p>b. The GSA will offer grants until allocated funding is expended in the specified period (i.e., April 1 – July 31; August 1 – November 30; December 1 – March 31).</p>	<p>b. <u>The GSA will offer awards until allocated funding is expended in the specified period (i.e., April 1 – July 31; August 1 – November 30; December 1 – March 31).</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
<p>c. If all available funds have been expended in the specified period, no additional applications will be accepted during that period.</p>	<p>c. If all available funds have been expended in the specified period, no additional applications will be accepted during that period.</p>	<p>c. <u>If all available funds have been expended in the specified period, no additional applications will be accepted during that period.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
<p>d. LG applications can be submitted four months before or after the lecture(s).</p>	<p>d. SGG applications can be submitted four months before or after the academic event.</p>	<p>d. <u>ASGA applications can be submitted no more than six weeks before or after the event.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A shorter timeframe increases the certainty that the event will take place.
<p>4. Applying for a LG</p>	<p>4. Applying for SGG</p>	<p>4. <u>Applying for ASGA</u></p>	
<p>a. Application forms are available on the</p>	<p>a. Application forms are available on</p>	<p>a. <u>Applications must be completed</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streamlined process; eliminates trips

GSA website.	the GSA website.	<u>online through the GSA website.</u>	to the GSA office. Grad students need not be in the same physical location as their chair. They can communicate by email or phone, and agree on a budget and short event description. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will be advised that the department chair/graduate chair will receive and be requested to confirm this information, which encourages accuracy from the start.
b.—Applicants must submit ONE copy of the application package to the GSA Office.	b.—Applicants must submit ONE copy of the application package to the GSA Office.	Delete.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groups apply online and no longer need to submit an application package.
5.—Allocation Policy	5.—Allocation Policy	5. <u>Allocation Policy</u>	
a.—LGs will be allocated at 75% of demonstrated need as detailed in the grant application up to a maximum of \$1,500.	a.—SGGs will be allocated at 75% of demonstrated need as detailed in the grant application up to a maximum of \$200.	a. <u>Funding will be allocated at 100% of shortfall up to a maximum of \$1500 per fiscal year (April 1 – March 31). There is no limit to the number of applications submitted within the fiscal year.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This allows graduate student groups to apply for multiple smaller events such as lunch seminars, or large events such as visiting lecturers. With a combined \$20,500 in funding we would be able to fund 20-30 graduate student groups.
b.—In the event that multiple LG applications are received and that insufficient funds remain for the specified period, the grant will be given to a graduate student group that has not recently received a LG.	b.—In the event that multiple SGG applications are received and that insufficient funds remain for the specified period, the grant will be given to a graduate student group that has not recently received a SGG.	b. <u>In the event that multiple ASGA applications are received at the same time and insufficient funds remain for the specified period, the award will be given to a graduate student group that has not recently received an ASGA.</u>	Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.
c.—A maximum of one LG will be provided to a graduate student group in any April 1 – March 31 period.	c.—A maximum of one SGG will be provided to a graduate student group in any April 1 – March 31 period.	c. <u>A maximum of one application may be submitted per event.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This allows graduate student groups to apply for multiple smaller events such as lunch seminars, or large events such as visiting lecturers.

<p>d. LGs will be awarded only for reasonable and allowable expenses and must comply with University of Alberta Expense Reimbursement policies and procedures as outlined in University of Alberta Policies and Procedures (UAPPOL) except for hosting expenses which are not eligible. See UAPPOL: In cases of dispute, the Vice-President Student Services will decide allowable expenses.</p>	<p>d. SGGs will be awarded only for reasonable and allowable expenses and must comply with University of Alberta Expense Reimbursement policies and procedures as outlined in University of Alberta Policies and Procedures (UAPPOL) except for hosting expenses which are not eligible. See UAPPOL: In cases of dispute, the Vice-President Student Services will decide allowable expenses.</p>	<p>d. <u>ASGAs will be awarded only for reasonable and allowable expenses, using the University's regulations on allowable expenses as a guideline. In cases of dispute, the Vice-President Student Services will decide on allowable expenses.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By moving to an awards program (rather than an expense reimbursement program) similar to FGSR's travel award program, we no longer need to collect receipts. • Note: This will not be a direct deposit process – GSA will issue cheques in the official name of the registered graduate student group.
<p>6. Appeals Policy</p>	<p>6. Appeals Policy</p>	<p>6. <u>Appeals Policy</u></p>	
<p>a. Any appeals of denied applications must be RECEIVED within ten calendar days.</p>	<p>a. Any appeals of denied applications must be RECEIVED within ten calendar days.</p>	<p>a. <u>Any appeals of denied applications must be received by the GSA within ten calendar days.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant, editorial/administrative.</p>
<p>b. Appeals must state the grounds for the appeal in writing and be sent to the GSA (c/o GSA Grants Specialist).</p>	<p>b. Appeals must state the grounds for the appeal in writing and be sent to the GSA (c/o GSA Grants Specialist).</p>	<p>b. <u>Appeals must state the grounds for the appeal in writing.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant, editorial/administrative.</p>
<p>c. Appeals will be reviewed at arm's length by the Vice-President Student Services (or designate if required) and two GSA Councillors selected by the President (or Speaker if there is a conflict of interest). All decisions are final and binding. Appeal decisions will normally be made within 20 calendar days.</p>	<p>c. Appeals will be reviewed at arm's length by the Vice-President Student Services (or designate if required) and two GSA Councillors selected by the President (or Speaker if there is a conflict of interest). All decisions are final and binding. Appeal decisions will normally be made within 20 calendar days.</p>	<p>c. <u>Appeals will be reviewed at arm's length by the Vice-President Student Services (or designate if required) and two GSA Councillors (including Speaker and CRO) selected by the President (or other elected official if there is a conflict of interest). All decisions are final and binding. Appeal decisions will normally be made within 20 calendar days.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p> <p>Administrative, to ensure arm's length decisions.</p>
<p>7. Budget Allocation Policy</p>	<p>7. Budget Allocation Policy</p>	<p>7. <u>Budget Allocation Policy</u></p>	

<p>a. Funds will normally be distributed as follows:</p>	<p>a. Funds will normally be distributed as follows:</p>	<p>a. <u>Funds will normally be distributed as follows:</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
<p>i. 10% of total annual LG budget will be held back as contingency funding while maintaining the principle that all funds will be allocated in each fiscal year (April 1 – March 31).</p>	<p>i. 10% of total annual SGG budget will be held back as contingency funding while maintaining the principle that all funds will be allocated in each fiscal year (April 1 – March 31).</p>	<p>i. <u>10% of total annual ASGA budget will be held back as contingency funding while maintaining the principle that all funds will be allocated in each fiscal year (April 1 – March 31).</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
<p>ii. Of annual budget, 1/3 will be allocated in the April 1 – July 31 period; 1/3 in the August 1 – November 30 period; and 1/3 in the December 1 – March 31 period.</p>	<p>ii. Of annual budget, 1/3 will be allocated in the April 1 – July 31 period; 1/3 in the August 1 – November 30 period; and 1/3 in the December 1 – March 31 period.</p>	<p>ii. <u>Of annual budget, 1/3 will be allocated in the April 1 – July 31 period; 1/3 in the August 1 – November 30 period; and 1/3 in the December 1 – March 31 period.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
<p>iii. If the funds have not been completely expended near the end of the fiscal year, a decision shall be made by the GSA Board on the best way to expend the funds.</p>	<p>iii. If the funds have not been completely expended near the end of the fiscal year, a decision shall be made by the GSA Board on the best way to expend the funds.</p>	<p>iii. <u>If the funds have not been completely expended near the end of the fiscal year, a decision shall be made by the GSA Board on the best way to expend the funds.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
<p>8. Office Procedures</p>	<p>8. Office Procedures</p>	<p>8. <u>Office Procedures</u></p>	
<p>a. Applications will be reviewed by the GSA staff for eligibility and completeness (see Eligibility Criteria and other policies above) using the following checklist:</p>	<p>a. Applications will be reviewed by the GSA staff for eligibility and completeness (see Eligibility Criteria and other policies above) using the</p>	<p>a. <u>Applications will be reviewed by the GSA office for eligibility and completeness (see Eligibility Criteria and other policies above) using the</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>

	following checklist:	following checklist:	
i.—The application form is complete and required documentation has been submitted;	I.—The application form is complete and required documentation has been submitted;	i. <u>The application information is complete and required documentation has been submitted or confirmed;</u>	Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.
ii.—The lecture has been organized by a graduate student group registered through Student Group Services, SUB;	II.—The event has been organized by a graduate student group registered through Student Group Services, SUB;	ii. <u>The event has been organized by a graduate student group registered through Student Group Services;</u>	Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.
iii.—The graduate student group has confirmed in the application that the lecture is an academic event;	III.—The graduate student group has confirmed in the application that the planned event is an academic activity;	iii. <u>The graduate student group has confirmed in the application that the planned event is an academic activity;</u>	Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.
iv.—The application has been signed by a Department Chair (or designate) in support of the lecture;	IV.—The application has been signed by a Department Chair (or designate) in support of the event;	iv. <u>The application has been verified and approved by the Department Chair (or designate) in support of the event;</u>	Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.
v.—There are sufficient funds available in the LG budget in the specified period that the application is received;	V.—There are sufficient funds available in the SGG budget in the specified period that the application is received;	v. <u>There are sufficient funds available in the ASGA budget in the specified period that the application is received;</u>	Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.
vi.—That no previous LG was allocated to the graduate student group in same April 1	VI.—That no previous SGG was allocated to the graduate student	vi. <u>That no previous ASGA was allocated to the graduate student</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See changes in Section 5 Allocation Policy

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg for 29Nov 2012

– March 31 period;	group in same April 1 – March 31 period;	<u>group for the same event.</u>	
vii. That expense claims comply with University of Alberta Expense Reimbursement policies and procedures	VII. That expense claims comply with University of Alberta Expense Reimbursement policies and procedures.	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By moving to an award format, rather than an expense reimbursement format, the need for receipts is eliminated. FGSR follows a similar format through its Travel Awards Program.
b. The graduate student group submitting the application will be contacted via email by the GSA Grants Specialist (or other designated staff member) regarding applications that are ineligible or incomplete in order to provide an opportunity to resolve the issue where possible.	b. The graduate student group submitting the application will be contacted via email by the GSA Grants Specialist (or other designated staff member) regarding applications that are ineligible or incomplete in order to provide an opportunity to resolve the issue where possible.	b. <u>The GSA will contact by email the graduate student group submitting the application regarding applications that are ineligible or incomplete in order to provide an opportunity to resolve the issue where possible.</u>	Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.
c. All applications will be reviewed and signed off by the Vice President Student Services or the Vice President Student Life (or designate).	c. All applications will be reviewed and signed off by the Vice President Student Services or the Vice President Student Life (or designate).	c. <u>All applications will be reviewed and signed off by the Vice-President Student Services or the Vice-President Student Life (or designate).</u>	Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.
d. Applicants who meet eligibility requirements will be notified by the GSA Grants Specialist via email of the pre-approved LG amount.	d. Applicants who meet eligibility requirements will be notified by the GSA Grants Specialist via email of the pre-approved SGG amount	d. <u>Applicants and Department Chairs will be notified by the GSA by email once processing has been completed and a decision has been made.</u>	Editorial/Administrative Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.
e. Once receipts are received by the GSA Grants Specialist, the application documents and receipts will be forwarded to the GSA Financial	e. Once receipts are received by the GSA Grants Specialist, the application documents and receipts will be forwarded to	<i>Delete.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move to an award program; Notification covered under 8.d.

<p>Manager for disbursement of the LG cheque. Once the cheque has been issued, the GSA Grants Specialist will contact via email the student group applicants and Department Chair (or designate).</p>	<p>the GSA Financial Manager for disbursement of the SGG cheque. Once the cheque has been issued, the GSA Grants Specialist will contact via email the student group applicants and Department Chair (or designate).</p>		
<p>9. Interpretation of LG Policy</p>	<p>9. Interpretation of SGG Policy</p>	<p>9. <u>Interpretation of ASGA Policy</u></p>	
<p>a. The GSA Board shall be consulted about any concerns and questions raised by the GSA office about interpretation of this policy. The Board's decision is final and binding.</p>	<p>a. The GSA Board shall be consulted about any concerns and questions raised by the GSA Office about interpretation of this policy. The Board's decision is final and binding.</p>	<p>a. <u>The GSA Board shall be consulted about any concerns and questions raised by the GSA office about interpretation of this policy. The Board's decision is final and binding.</u></p>	<p>Merging of the Lecture Grant and Student Group Grant.</p>
<p>10. Changes to Policy & Forms</p>	<p>10. Changes to Policy & Forms</p>	<p>10. <u>Changes to ASGA Policy</u></p>	
<p>a. The application policy, information, and forms are subject to GSA Council approval and cannot be changed without Council's approval — excluding editorial revisions/clarification.</p>	<p>a. The application policy, information, and forms are subject to GSA Council approval and cannot be changed without Council's approval — excluding editorial revisions/clarification.</p>	<p>a. <u>ASGA policy is subject to GSA Council approval and cannot be changed without Council's approval — excluding editorial revisions/clarification.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will no longer be forms; policy changes remain subject to Council approval.

Emergency Bursaries: The information below is an overview/summary of the substantive proposed change outlined in the three-column proposal that follows.

The purpose of the GSA Emergency Bursary program is to assist graduate students due to an unanticipated emergency. The proposal to add an exceptional circumstances clause (see §5i below) was an outcome of a productive meeting recently held in the GSA with Rachel De Leon, UBEF Bursary Program Coordinator, who brought this question to our attention. From time to time graduate students present exceptional circumstances to UBEF where they require more than the \$1500 maximum or are in need of more than one EB within the same fiscal year (eg, unanticipated, exceptional travel costs because both parents passed away within 10 months of each other). During that meeting, Rachel also advised that continuing to have UBEF (University Bursaries and Emergency Funding) manage GSA EBs was a **good fit with their portfolio** since they can then also direct graduate students to additional services.

Proposed Changes to Grant Application Policy and Information: Emergency Bursaries

Current Policy Manual (<i>Deletions noted by a strikethrough</i>)	Proposed Policy Manual(<i>New changes underlined</i>)	Rationale / Background
5. Emergency Bursaries	<i>No Changes.</i>	
1. Sponsor / Purpose	<i>No Changes.</i>	
a. The Graduate Students’ Association (GSA) Emergency Bursary (EB) is a non-repayable bursary for graduate students who need assistance due to an unanticipated emergency. EBs for graduate students are provided by the GSA through collective agreement negotiations for the Academically Employed Graduate Student (AEGS) fund.	a. The Graduate Students’ Association (GSA) Emergency Bursary (EB) is a non-repayable bursary for graduate students who need assistance due to an unanticipated emergency. EBs for graduate students are provided by the GSA through collective agreement negotiations for the <u>Academic Employment of Graduate Students</u> (AEGS) fund.	Editorial (change to official name in CA)
2. Eligibility Criteria [...]	<i>No Changes.</i>	
3. Application Information [...]	<i>No Changes.</i>	
4. Applying for an EB [...]	<i>No Changes.</i>	
5. Allocation Policy	<i>No Changes.</i>	
a. There is no limit to the number of EB applications a graduate student can submit during his/her degree program.	<i>No Changes.</i>	
b. There is a maximum of one EB per fiscal year (April 1 – March 31).	<i>No Changes.</i>	
c. The maximum amount that will be awarded to a graduate student for an EB is \$1,500.	<i>No Changes.</i>	

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg 29 Nov 2012

File Path: c:\users\gsa user\downloads\eb policy changes (full policy) - proposal and 3-column.docx

d. EBs are reviewed by the UBEF Office.	<i>No Changes.</i>	
e. The EAA from the UBEF office will meet with the graduate student applicant and assess the application including the relevant documentation.	e. <u>A staff member</u> from the UBEF office will meet with the graduate student applicant and assess the application including the relevant documentation.	Editorial/Administrative
f. Laptop replacements will not be considered unless the laptop was stolen and a police report is provided.	<i>No Changes.</i>	
g. Dental costs will not be funded if the student has opted out of the health and dental plan.	<i>No Changes.</i>	
h. If it is determined by the EAA that a graduate student is in need of emergency funding, the EAA's recommendation together with a report and documentation will be sent to the Executive Director (or delegate).	h. If it is determined by the <u>UBEF staff</u> member that a graduate student is in need of emergency funding, the <u>UBEF</u> recommendation together with a report and documentation will be sent to the <u>GSA</u> Executive Director (or delegate).	Editorial/Administrative
	i. <u>Under exceptional circumstances and upon the recommendation of UBEF, the GSA President (or delegate) may agree to waive the maximum allocation policies or other eligibility criteria.</u>	From time to time graduate students present exceptional circumstances to UBEF where they require more than the \$1,500 maximum or are in need of additional bursaries within the fiscal year (eg, unanticipated, exceptional travel costs because both parents passed away within 10 months of each other).
6. Appeals Policy	<i>No Changes.</i>	
a. Any appeals of denied applications must be RECEIVED within ten calendar days.	a. Any appeals of denied applications must be received <u>by the GSA</u> within ten calendar days.	Editorial/Administrative
b. Appeals must state the grounds for the appeal in writing and be sent to the GSA (c/o GSA Grants Specialist).	b. Appeals must state the grounds for the appeal in writing.	Editorial/Administrative
c. Appeals will be reviewed at arm's length by the Vice-President Student Services (or designate if required) and two GSA Councillors selected by the President (or Speaker if there is a conflict of interest). All decisions are final and binding. Appeal decisions will normally be	c. Appeals will be reviewed at arm's length by the Vice-President Student Services (or designate if required) and two GSA Councillors <u>(including Speaker and CRO)</u> selected by the President (or <u>other elected official</u> if there is a conflict of interest). All decisions are final and binding. Appeal decisions will normally be made within 20 calendar days.	Administrative, to ensure arm's length decisions.

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg 29 Nov 2012

File Path: c:\users\gsa user\downloads\eb policy changes (full policy) - proposal and 3-column.docx

made within 20 calendar days.		
7. Budget Allocation Policy [...]	<i>No Changes.</i>	
8. Office Procedures	<i>No Changes.</i>	
a. The GSA Financial Manager will review the report and documentation supplied by the EAA.	a. <u>Applications will be reviewed by the GSA office for eligibility and completeness (see Eligibility Criteria and other policies above) using the following checklist:</u>	Editorial/Administrative
b. Before issuing a cheque, the GSA Financial Manager will ensure that:	<i>Delete.</i>	Editorial/Administrative Redundant line
i. The student has not applied for other AEGS funds for the same purpose as the UBEF application;	i. The student has not applied for other AEGS funds for the same purpose as the <u>EB</u> application;	Editorial/Administrative
ii. All relevant regulations have been observed.	<i>No Changes.</i>	
c. UBEF will contact EB recipients via email when a cheque is available for pick up at the GSA Office.	<i>No Changes.</i>	
9. Interpretation of EB Policy [...]	<i>No Changes.</i>	
10. Changes to Policy and Form [...]	<i>No Changes.</i>	

Statistics

2011 – 2012 Fiscal Year: Emergency Bursaries

Total Amount of Funding: \$83,375

Total Number of Students Funded: 64

CLOSING DATA 2011-12

Period 1 runs from: April 1 – July 31 (Did not close early)

Period 2 runs from: August 1 – November 30 (Did not close early)

Period 3 runs from: December 1 – March 31 (Did not close early)

2010 – 2011 Fiscal Year: Emergency Bursaries

Total Amount of Funding: \$29,184

Total Number of Students Funded: 31

Prepared by C Germain/H Hogg 29 Nov 2012

File Path: c:\users\gsa user\downloads\eb policy changes (full policy) - proposal and 3-column.docx

Outline of Issue

GSA Awards and Adjudication Criteria Policy: Proposed Changes to the Graduate Student Teaching Award and to the Graduate Student Teaching Assistant Awards

Motion:

That GSA Council **approve** the proposed revisions to the *Graduate Student Teaching Award* and the *Graduate Student Teaching Assistant Awards*, as outlined in the attached three-column document.

NOTE: The essence of this proposal is laid out in “background” and the proposal recommends that the criteria for the *Graduate Student Teaching Award* and the *Graduate Student Teaching Assistant Awards* be changed from four criteria to three

Jurisdiction:

GSA awards are outlined in the Policy Manual under “Awards and Adjudication Criteria” and can be reviewed at

www.gsa.ualberta.ca/en/05Governance/~media/gsa/GoverningDocuments/PolicyManual.pdf

Policy Manual changes require approval at one meeting of Council (GSA Bylaw Part I, 2.2). For Bylaws see www.gsa.ualberta.ca/en/05Governance/~media/gsa/GoverningDocuments/Bylaws.pdf

GSA Bylaws (relevant excerpts)

Part I **AUTHORITY** [...]

2 Policy Manual

2.1 The Policy Manual shall contain all policies and procedures passed by Council except as contained in any other governing document.

2.2 The Policy Manual is under the jurisdiction of Council (Part III) and may be amended by a simple majority vote of Council at any meeting of Council. [...]

Part VII **STANDING COMMITTEES** [...]

5 Awards Selection Committee [...]

5.2 Mandate

5.2.1 The ASC is responsible for all aspects of the awards, including, but not limited to:

5.2.1.1 The number of awards available;

5.2.1.2 The recipient selection criteria;

5.2.1.3 The names of the awards;

5.2.1.4 The award nomination procedures and forms; and

5.2.1.5 The value of the awards [...]

Background: A review of GSA Awards was undertaken by former GSA VP Student Life, Hillary Sparkes, at the request of GSA President Ashlyn Bernier. In Ms. Sparkes’ review, she recommended that the criteria for the *Graduate Student Teaching Award* and the *Graduate Student Teaching Assistant Awards* be changed from four criteria to three. Members of the Awards Selection Committee then had an opportunity to review the suggested revisions and raised no concerns. The GSA Board recommended that these proposed revisions be forwarded to Council for consideration on 21 November 2012.

Prepared by HM Hogg and K Biittner for GSA Council 10 Dec 2012

These proposed changes and their rationale are outlined in the attached document. Upon approval, the revisions will be implemented and used in the 2013 GSA Awards competition and onwards.

GSA Awards and Adjudication Criteria Policy: Proposed Changes to the Graduate Student Teaching Award and to the Graduate Student Teaching Assistant Awards

Current Policy Manual (<i>Deletions noted by a strikethrough</i>)	Proposed Changes (<i>Additions Underlined</i>)	Rationale / Background
---	--	------------------------

Please note that any approved changes will also appear on the application and information forms for each award.

7. Graduate Student Teaching Award		
1. The purpose of this award is to give special recognition to graduate student instructors who are especially skillful and dedicated teachers. Any member of the Graduate Students' Association who is a Principal Instructor at the University of Alberta is eligible for this award.	<i>No changes</i>	
2. There are two graduate student teaching awards:	<i>No changes</i>	
3. The Zita and John Rose Teaching Award	<i>No changes</i>	
4. The GSA Graduate Student Teaching Award	<i>No changes</i>	
5. Both awards will be adjudicated on the basis of four criteria. The criteria are: quality of teaching evaluations, effort to build a constructive rapport with students, number and diversity of courses taught , and evidence of dedication to teaching and students. Each criteria will be ranked on a scale of 1-5 (5 being high) and then added to determine the total rank for the nominee. The highest ranking nominee will receive the Zita and John Rosen Award. The second and third ranked nominees will receive the GSA Graduate Student Teaching Awards.	5. Both awards will be adjudicated on the basis of <u>three</u> criteria. The criteria are: quality of teaching evaluations, effort to build a constructive rapport with students, and evidence of dedication to teaching and students. Each criteria will be ranked on a scale of 1-5 (5 being high) and then added to determine the total rank for the nominee. The highest ranking nominee will receive the Zita and John Rosen Award. The second and third ranked nominees will receive the GSA Graduate Student Teaching Awards.	It is proposed that the evaluation criteria be changed from four to three points. The motivation behind removing "the number and diversity of courses taught" was to not penalize a great instructor who has not had many opportunities to teach. Many graduate programs provided teaching assistant and sessional positions based on funding availability and a graduate student does not always get to choose the course he/she will be teaching.
6. One (1) Zita and John Rosen Award valued at \$1000 and two (2) GSA Graduate Student Teaching Awards one valued at \$750 and the other at \$500 will be awarded annually. Funding for the Zita and John Rosen Award is donated annually from the Rosen Family/City Lumber. This award will be available each year, subject to external funding. The	<i>No changes</i>	

Prepared by K Biittner and H Hogg for GSA Council 10 December 2012

GSA Graduate Student Teaching Awards are provided by the Academically-employed Graduate Student Funds (AEGS) Funds.		
7. Only University of Alberta courses taught as a Principal Instructor during the graduate student’s current academic program (as a graduate student of the University of Alberta) will be considered.	<i>No changes</i>	

12. Graduate Student Teaching Assistant Awards		
1. The purpose of these awards is to give special recognition to graduate student teaching assistants who are especially skillful and dedicated teachers. Any member of the Graduate Students’ Association who is a Teaching Assistant (T.A.) at the University of Alberta is eligible for this award.	<i>No changes</i>	
2. These awards will be adjudicated on the basis of four criteria. The criteria are: quality of teaching evaluations, effort to build a constructive rapport with students, number and diversity of courses taught , and evidence of dedication to teaching and students. Each criteria will be ranked on a scale of 1-5 (5 being high) and then added to determine the total rank of the nominee.	2. These awards will be adjudicated on the basis of <u>three</u> criteria. The criteria are: quality of teaching evaluations, effort to build a constructive rapport with students, and evidence of dedication to teaching and students. Each criteria will be ranked on a scale of 1-5 (5 being high) and then added to determine the total rank of the nominee.	The evaluation criteria were changed from four to three points. The motivation behind removing the “number and diversity of courses taught” was to not penalize a great T.A. who has not had many opportunities to teach. Many graduate programs provide teaching assistant and sessional positions based on funding and a student does not always get to choose the course he/she will be teaching.
3. One Gold (valued at \$1000), one Silver (valued at \$750), and one Bronze (valued at \$500) awards will be awarded annually. These awards are funded by the Academically-employed Graduate Student (AEGS) fund.	<i>No changes</i>	
4. Only T.A. appointments for University of Alberta courses during the graduate student’s current academic program (as a graduate student of the University of Alberta) will be considered.	<i>No changes</i>	

CLE Subcommittee on Attributes and Competencies

Environmental Scan

Student attributes describe the qualities, values and dispositions that students develop as a result of their time at university. While not dissociated from disciplinary knowledge, they are fostered in each student regardless of field of study. Student attributes are broader than skills or technical competencies and are integrated throughout a higher education experience.

Based on previous definitions considered within the literature, the above definition best fits the objectives of the conversation on student attributes at the University of Alberta. It distinguishes attributes from skills, emphasizes cross-disciplinary involvement and applies to both graduate and undergraduate students. Prior to engaging in the topic, it is necessary to establish a common definition for student attributes as a means to avoid ambiguous terminology and to encourage productive discourse from all members of the University community.

In the current climate, in which universities seek to define their unique placement within the provincial, national and international education sector, and in which governments, taxpayers and students seek greater accountability for investments in post-secondary education, student attributes are becoming increasingly important to the strategic planning processes for research-intensive universities worldwide. From the Tuning Project in the European Union to quality assurance agencies in the United Kingdom and TEQSA¹ in Australia, governments are asserting greater control and demanding an outcomes-based approach to post-secondary education standards².

The shift toward greater accountability of student development is driven not only by governments, but also by industry and by students themselves. Research universities are now being pressed to go beyond equipping students with knowledge and produce adults that are culturally aware, adaptive to change, and globally competitive. Within this context and regardless of government mandate, the development of student attributes has clear strategic importance to universities who aim to not only educate contributing members of society, but also foster their holistic intellectual development.

The discussion of student attributes began in Australia during the early 1990s, using the term “Personal Transferable Skills”. As a condition of funding, Australian universities now must include a statement on generic outcomes of education in their operational plans. In addition, TEQSA’s initial audit recommendations of major universities have included considerable focus on student attributes^{3 4 5}.

¹ Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency

² Barrie, Simon C. ‘A research-based approach to generic graduate attributes policy’, *Higher Education Research and Development*. 23 (2004): 261-275

³ Barrie, Simon C. ‘Understanding what we mean by the generic attributes of graduates. *Higher Education*, 32(4) 261-275.

Yet the aforementioned factors influencing the shift toward student attributes – massification of post-secondary education, increased investment accountability, and the development of the knowledge economy – are not isolated to universities in Australia. Certain Canadian accreditation agencies have already begun shifting towards an outcome-based approach and, while the creation of a provincial quality assurance agency is not a certainty, projects in other jurisdictions indicate a prevailing trend in this direction^{6 7}. In fact, the Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents created a report in 2005 that explicitly outlined expectations for undergraduate degree program graduates within its public post-secondary education system to monitor the effectiveness of instruction⁸.

Many examples exist from institutions that have acted in haste to adopt student attributes as a response to quality assurance initiatives; the final product being poorly-conceived attributes that do not reflect the entirety of the institution's academic programs and struggle to achieve consensus and collaboration among faculty for comprehensive implementation. Successful implementation and articulation of attributes stem from an organic, collaborative development process that engages the university community in an introspective discussion. This is the approach that has been committed to by the Subcommittee on Attributes and Competencies, and will continue to ground the process in the future.

The implementation stage of student attribute introduction is particularly crucial to the project's success. Significant comprehension and proper development of attributes depend critically on the explicit integration of attributes into the university experience⁹. Once chosen, student attributes require widespread communication – through instructors, student leaders and administrators – and support for curriculum updates and instructional incorporation in order to permeate the university experience. Leaving student attributes as an implicit directive has been found to be ineffective.

A commitment to adopting this report's attributes will allow us to define the unique nature of a degree from a research-intensive institution that is pervasively framed within the University of Alberta's distinct educational context. By elucidating what makes a U of A graduate unique, and integrating those attributes throughout each program, we are contributing to the creation of identifiable, cross-disciplinary links between our students that will serve as a distinguishing feature of our institution. The University of Alberta will be seen as a Canadian leader in preparing its students for an unknown future.

⁴ Burgess et al., *Report of an Audit of the University of Sydney*. Melbourne: TEQSA, January 2012. Accessed November 15, 2012. www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/auditreport_usyd_2012.pdf.

⁵ Cooper et al., *Report of an Audit of the University of Tasmania*. Melbourne: TEQSA, March 2012. Accessed November 15, 2012. www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/auditreport_utas_2012.pdf

⁶ Accreditation Board, *Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board: Accreditation Criteria and Procedures*. Ottawa: Canadian Council of Professional Engineers, 2011. Accessed November 20, 2012. http://www.engineerscanada.ca/e/pu_ab.cfm

⁷ Liaison Committee on Medical Education, *Functions and Structure of a Medical School: Standards for Accreditation of Medical Education Programs Leading to the M.D. Degree*. Ottawa: AFMC, May 2012. Accessed November 20, 2012. <http://www.lcme.org/pubs.htm#fands>

⁸ Working Group on University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations. *Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents (OCAV): Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations*. 2005.

University of Alberta Context

In 2009, the Centre for Teaching and Learning provided a discussion paper on student attributes to the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and the writers of the Academic Plan. This document was circulated for wider discussion and, with substantial support from the University Community, the development of student attributes was decided to be a key objective for the institution.

The University of Alberta's Academic Plan, *Dare to Deliver 2011-2015*, commits to "Articulating and supporting the development of core sets of skills, attributes, and values to be incorporated into graduate and undergraduate programs, while recognizing that each Faculty will best decide how to move in this direction, which could include reviewing and updating the curriculum."

In October 2011, the Committee on the Learning Environment struck the Subcommittee on Attributes and Competencies. Its mandate is to review literature, define terms, consult, determine commonalities, and develop a model of implementation surrounding student attributes. (See Appendix I for the CLE-approved Terms of Reference)

Since then, the Subcommittee has met a number of times. It reviewed the literature and research on graduate student attributes so as to better orient itself to the nature of student attributes. Practices at other institutions were surveyed, including Ontario universities and the University of Sydney. Over 5000 undergraduate students provided their feedback on what attributes they developed during the course of their University of Alberta education. Students, both graduate and undergraduate, were consulted on a draft list of attributes via the respective councils of the SU and the GSA. The three co-chairs synthesized this data and presented it to the subcommittee for further discussion. The draft list of attributes that follows is the result of a number of meetings and conversations, ensuring that attributes accurately reflect the needs and aspirations of students, the current academic programs of faculties, and the requirements imposed by accrediting bodies.

The subcommittee consists of a diverse group of representatives, including undergraduate and graduate students, administrators, and staff from the Faculties of Arts, Science, Education, Engineering, Medicine and Dentistry, Graduate Studies and Research, as well as Campus St Jean and Augustana Campus.

Attributes

Imparting advanced knowledge is inherently a core objective of a university education. However, there are additional outcomes of the educational enterprise that form the foundation of success for both students and society as a whole. The list below captures the essence of the attributes and competencies that have been identified to characterize a University of Alberta graduate. These qualities are interconnected and are developed in a variety of ways through the student experience on campus, paving the way for individual excellence and leadership.

- 1. Ethical responsibility**
 - a. Global citizenship
 - b. Community engagement
 - c. Social and environmental awareness
 - d. Professionalism
- 2. Scholarship**
 - a. Knowledge breadth and depth
 - b. Interdisciplinarity
 - c. Life-long learning
 - d. Investigation
- 3. Critical thinking**
 - a. Analytic and synthetic reasoning
 - b. Interpretive proficiency
 - c. Intellectual curiosity
 - d. Information literacy
- 4. Communication**
 - a. Writing skills
 - b. Oral skills
 - c. Visual communication
 - d. Multilingualism
- 5. Collaboration**
 - a. Openness to diversity
 - b. Interpersonal skills
 - c. Adaptability and compromise
 - d. Individual contribution
- 6. Creativity**
 - a. Imagination
 - b. Innovation
 - c. Divergent thinking
 - d. Artistic sensibility
- 7. Confidence**
 - a. Leadership and empowerment
 - b. Independence
 - c. Initiative
 - d. Resilience

Model for Implementation

To come

Appendix I

University of Alberta
Committee on the Learning Environment Subcommittee on
Attributes and Competencies
TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Committee Mandate:

Following the approval of the University of Alberta's 2011-2015 Academic Plan entitled *Dare to Deliver*, graduate attributes have become a subject of thoughtful discussion across campus. On April 7 2011, the Committee on the Learning Environment Subcommittee on Attributes and Competencies was struck at a joint CLE-TLAT meeting. The committee will work in accordance to the statement pertaining to graduate attributes in the Academic Plan:

"Attributes and Competencies Upon Graduation: Articulating and supporting the development of core sets of skills, attributes and values to be incorporated into graduate and undergraduate programs, while recognizing that each Faculty will best decide how to move in this direction, which could include reviewing and updating the curriculum."

2. Committee Roles:

The subcommittee will play numerous roles:

- Engage in a review of graduate attribute literature
- Provide definitions to key terminology in the graduate attributes process in order to clarify committee discussions and consultations
- Consult widely across campus in order to learn about the distinct character of University of Alberta students
- Select several themes that are common to the graduate attributes described by members of different faculties
- Develop a model for the implementation of graduate attributes at the University of Alberta
- Report to the Committee on the Learning Environment on a monthly basis

3. Committee Membership:

The committee membership shall consist of a diverse group of representatives from across the

Academy.

- Vice-President Academic, Students' Union – Co-chair: Emerson Csorba
- Vice-President Academic, Graduate Students' Association – Co-chair: Nima Yousefi Moghaddam
- Academic Staff representative – Co-chair: Dr. Steven Dew
- One (1) undergraduate student at-large representative: Dustin Chelen
- One (1) graduate student at-large representative: Ashlyn Bernier
- One (1) CLE graduate student representative: Anne McIntosh
- One (1) CLE undergraduate student representative: Erendira Cervantes-Altamirano
- One (1) representative from the Faculty of Arts: Dr. Daphne Read
- One (1) representative from the Faculty of Science: Dr. Arturo Sanchez
- One (1) representative from the Campus Saint-Jean: Dr. Donald Ipperciel
- One (1) representative from the Augustana Campus: Dr. Paula Marentette
- One (1) representative from the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry: Dr. Fraser Brenneis
- One (1) representative from the Faculty of Education: Dr. Genevieve Gauthier
- One (1) representative from the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research: Dr. Renee Polziehn

In addition to the members serving on the committee, numerous university stakeholders will be consistently invited to committee meetings so that a wide range of perspectives are heard and considered throughout the committee's proceedings.

4. Committee Meetings:

The committee will meet on a biweekly basis, with thorough stakeholder consultations taking place in between meetings when necessary.